

10 A A a

AN
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,
ANTIENT AND MODERN,
FROM
THE BIRTH OF CHRIST
TO THE
BEGINNING OF THE PRESENT CENTURY:
IN WHICH

The Rise, Progress, and Variations of CHURCH POWER

ARE CONSIDERED

In their Connexion with the State of LEARNING and PHILOSOPHY,
and the POLITICAL HISTORY of EUROPE, during that Period.

By the late learned

JOHN LAWRENCE MOSHEIM, D. D.

And Chancellor of the University of GOTTINGEN.

Translated from the ORIGINAL,
And accompanied with NOTES and CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES,
By ARCHIBALD MACLAINE, M. A.
Minister of the ENGLISH CHURCH at the HAGUE.

To the whole is added AN ACCURATE INDEX.

VOL. II.

L O N D O N,

Printed for A. MILLAR, in *The Strand*. MDCCLXV.

12

ECCEASTICAL HISTORY
ANTIENT AND MODERN

THE BIRTH OF CHRIST

BEGINNING OF THE PRESENT CENTURY

IN WHICH

THE PRINCIPAL DOCTRINES OF CHURCH POWER



JOHN LANKESHIRE, D.D.

34

THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

IN ALEXANDRIA, BY

THE BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA

TO THE

VOL. II

LONDON

PRINTED BY

A
COMPENDIOUS VIEW
OF
Ecclesiastical History.

BOOK THE FOURTH.

CONTAINING THE

HISTORY of the CHURCH,

FROM

The Beginning of the Reformation by Luther

TO

THE PRESENT TIMES.

COMPREHENSIVE VIEW

OF

Ecclesiastical History.

BOOK THE FOURTH

OF THE REFORMATION

HISTORY of the CHURCH

FROM

The Beginning of the Reformation by Luther

TO

THE PRESENT TIMES.

LONDON

AND

NEW YORK

INTRODUCTION.

I. **T**HE order and method, that have been followed in the former part of this Work, cannot be continued, without the greatest inconveniences, in this Fourth book, which relates to the modern history of the church. From the commencement of the sixteenth

The method observed in the preceding part of this history changed in the Fourth book.

century the face of religion was remarkably changed, the divisions, that had formerly perplexed the church, increased considerably, and the Christian societies, that relinquished the established forms of divine worship, and erected themselves into separate assemblies upon principles different from those of the Roman hierarchy, multiplied from day to day. This circumstance renders it impossible to present in one connected series, or, as it were, in one continued tablature, the events, vicissitudes, and revolutions, that happened in the church, divided its members, and enfeebled the dominion of its tyrants. From the period on which we now enter, the bond of union among Christians, that had been formed by a blind obedience to the Roman pontiffs, was every where either dissolved, or, at least, relaxed; and consequently this period of our history must be divided into a multitude of branches, into as many parts, as there were famous sects that arose in this century.

II. It is, however, proper to observe here, that many of the events, which distinguish this century, had a manifest relation to the church in general, and not to any Christian society in particular. And as these events deserve to be mentioned separately on account of their remarkable tendency to throw a light upon the state of Christianity in general, as well as upon the history of each particular Christian society, we shall therefore divide this Fourth book into two main and principal parts, of which the one shall contain the *General*, and the other the *Particular History of the Christian Religion*.

The history of the church in this century may be divided into two general heads.

III. To the *General History* belong all those events, which relate to the state of Christianity, considered in itself and in its utmost extent, to the Christian church viewed in the general, and abstracted from the miserable and multiplied divisions into which it was rent by the passions of men. Under this head we shall take notice of the advancement and progress of Christianity in general, without any regard to the particular sects that were

The general history of the church — its extent.

thus instrumental in promoting its interests, nor shall we omit the consideration of certain doctrines, rites, and institutions, which appeared worthy of admission to all, or, at least, to the greatest part of the Christian sects, and which, consequently, produced every where changes and improvements of more or less importance.

Particular
history.

IV. In the *Particular History* of this century we propose passing in review, in their proper order, the various sects into which the Christian church was divided. This part of our work, for the sake of method and precision, we shall subdivide into two. In the *first* we shall comprehend what relates to the more *ancient* Christian sects, both in the eastern and western hemispheres; while the *second* shall be confined to the history of those more *modern* societies, the date of whose origin is posterior to the Reformation in *Germany*. In the accounts that are here to be given of the circumstances, fate, and doctrines of each sect, the method laid down in the Preface to this Work shall be rigorously observed, as far as is possible, as it seems the most adapted to lead us to an accurate knowledge of the nature, progress, and tenets of every Christian society, that arose in these times of discord.

History of the
Reformation.

V. The most momentous event that distinguished the church after the fifteenth century, and we may add, the most glorious of all the Revolutions that happened in the state of Christianity since the time of its divine and immortal founder, was that happy change introduced into religion, which is known by the title of the *Blessed Reformation*. This grand revolution, which arose in *Saxony* from small beginnings, not only spread itself with the utmost rapidity through all the European provinces, but also extended its efficacy more or less to the most distant parts of the globe, and may be justly considered as the main and principal spring which has moved the nations from that illustrious period, and occasioned the greatest part both of those civil and religious revolutions that fill the annals of history down to our times. The face of *Europe* was, in a more especial manner, changed by this great event. The present age feels yet, in a sensible manner, and ages to come will continue to perceive the inestimable advantages it *produced*, and the inconveniencies of which it has been the *innocent occasion*. The history, therefore, of such an important revolution, from whence so many others have derived their origin, and whose relations and connexions are so extensive and universal, demands, undoubtedly, a peculiar degree of attention, and has an unquestionable right to the principal place in such a Work as this. We therefore now proceed to give a compendious view of the modern history of the Christian church according to the plan and method already laid down.

THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

SECTION I.

The History of the Reformation.

THE History of the Reformation is too ample and extensive to be comprehended without a certain degree of confusion, in the uninterrupted narration of one Section; we shall therefore divide it into Four parts,

The FIRST shall contain *An Account of the State of Christianity before the Commencement of the Reformation.*

The SECOND shall comprehend *The History of the Reformation, from its first Beginnings until the date of the Confession drawn up at Augsburg.*

The THIRD shall exhibit *A View of the same History, from this latter period to the Commencement of the war of Smalcald: And,*

The FOURTH shall carry it down to *The Peace that was entered into with the Abettors of the Reformation in the year 1555 [a].* This division is natural; it arises spontaneously from the events themselves.

CENT. XVI.

The division of this first section,

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the state of the Christian church before the Reformation.

I. ABOUT the commencement of this century the Roman pontiffs lived in the utmost tranquillity; nor had they, as things appeared to be situated, the least reason to apprehend any opposition to their pretensions or rebellion against their authority; since those dreadful commotions, which

Things are in a quiet state at the beginning of this century.

[a] The writers of the *History of the Reformation*, of every rank and order, are enumerated by the very learned PHILIP. FRID. HANE, (who himself deserves a most eminent rank in this class) in his *Historia Sacrorum a Luthero Emendatorum*, part. I. cap. I. p. 1. and by JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Centifolium Lutherianum*, part. II. cap. cxxxvii. p. 863. — The greatest part, or at least the most eminent of this list of authors must be consulted by such as desire a farther confirmation or illustration of the matters, which I propose to relate briefly in the course of this History. The illustrious names of SEVIDAN and SECKENDORFF, and others, who have distinguished themselves in this kind of erudition are too well known to render it necessary to recommend their works to the perusal of the curious reader.

CENT. XVI. had been excited in the preceding ages by the Waldenses, Albigenses, and Beghards, and lately by the Bohemians, were entirely suppressed, and had yielded to the united powers of counsel and the sword. Such of the Waldenses as yet remained, lived contented under the difficulties of extreme poverty in the vallies of *Piedmont*, and proposed to themselves no higher earthly felicity, than that of leaving to their descendants that wretched and obscure corner of *Europe* which separates the *Alps* from the *Pyrenean* mountains; while the handful of Bohemians, that survived the ruin of their faction, and still persevered in their opposition to the Roman yoke, had neither strength nor knowledge adequate to any new attempt, and therefore, instead of inspiring terror, became objects of contempt.

The complaints
against the popes
and clergy, inef-
fectual.

II. We must not, however, conclude from this apparent tranquillity and security of the pontifs and their adherents, that their measures were applauded, or their chains worn without reluctance. This was far from being the case. Not only private persons, but also the most powerful princes and sovereign states exclaimed loudly against the despotic dominion of the pontifs, the fraud, violence, avarice and injustice that prevailed in their counsels, the arrogance, tyranny, and extortion of their legates, the unbridled licentiousness and enormous crimes of the clergy and monks of all denominations, the unrighteous severity and partiality of the Roman laws, and demanded publicly, as their ancestors had done before them, a *Reformation* of the church in its head and in its members, and a general council to accomplish that necessary and happy purpose [b]. But these complaints and demands were not carried so far as to produce any good effect; since they came from persons who never presumed to entertain the least doubt of the supreme authority of the pope in religious matters, and who, of consequence, instead of attempting, themselves, to bring about that reformation that was so ardently desired, remained entirely unactive, and looked for redress to the court of *Rome*, or to a general council. As long as the authority of the Roman pontif was held sacred, and his jurisdiction supreme, there could be no reason to expect any considerable reformation either of the corruptions of the church or of the manners of the clergy.

The Restoration
of learning.

III. If any thing seemed proper to destroy the gloomy empire of superstition, and to alarm the security of the lordly pontifs, it was the restoration of learning in *Europe*, and the number of men of genius that arose, of a sudden, under the benign influence of that auspicious revolution. But even this new scene of things was insufficient to terrify the lords of the church, or to make them apprehend the decline of their power. It is true, indeed, this happy revolution in the republic of letters dispelled the gloom

[b] These complaints and accusations have been largely enumerated by several writers. See, among many others, VAL. ERN. LOESCHERUS, in *Actis et Documentis Reformationis*, tom. i. cap. v. p. 105.—cap. ix. p. 184. & ERN. SALOM. CYPRIAN. *Præfat. ad Wilh. Ern. Tenzelii Historiam Reformat.* published at *Leipsic* in 8^{vo}. in the year 1717.—The grievances, complained of by the Germans in particular, are amply mentioned by J. F. GEORGIUS, in his *Gravamina Imperator. et Nationis German. adversus sedem Roman.* cap. vii. p. 261. Nor do the wiser and more learned among the modern Romanists pretend to deny that the church and clergy, before the time of Luther, were corrupted in a very high degree.

of ignorance, and kindled in the minds of many the love of truth and sacred liberty. Nay, it is also certain that many of these great men, such as ERASMUS and others, pointed the delicacy of their wit, or levelled the fury of their indignation at the superstitions of the times, the corruptions of the priesthood, the abuses that reigned in the court of *Rome*, and the brutish manners of the Monastic Orders. But this was not sufficient; since none had the courage to strike at the root of the evil, to attack the papal jurisdiction and statutes, which were absurdly, yet artfully sanctified by the title of *canon law*, or to call in question that ancient and most pernicious opinion, that *Christ* had established a vice-gerent at *Rome*, cloathed with his supreme and unlimited authority. Entrenched, therefore, within these strong-holds, the pontiffs looked upon their own authority, and the peace of the church as beyond the reach of danger, and treated with indifference the threats and invectives of their enemies. Armed, moreover, with power to punish, and abundantly furnished with the means of rewarding in the most alluring manner, they were ready, on every commotion, to crush the obstinate, and to gain over the mercenary to their cause; and this indeed could not but contribute considerably to the stability of their dominion.

IV. Hence it was, that the bishops of *Rome* lived in the utmost security and ease, and, being entirely free from apprehensions and cares of every kind, followed without reluctance, and gratified without any limitation or restraint, the various demands of their lusts and passions. ALEXANDER VI, whom Humanity disowns, and who is rather to be considered as a monster, than as a man, whose deeds excite horror, and whose enormities place him among the most execrable tyrants of ancient times, stained the commencement of this century by the most tremendous crimes. The world was delivered from this papabfiend in the year 1503, by the poisonous draught which he had prepared for others, as is generally believed; though there are historians that attribute his death to sickness and old-age [c]. He was succeeded in the Pontificate by Pius III, who, in less than a month, was deprived by death of that high dignity. The vacant chair was obtained by fraud and bribery by JULIAN DE LA ROVERE, who assumed the denomination of JULIUS II.

The pope:
Alexander VI.
Pius III.

V. To the odious list of vices with which JULIUS II dishonoured the pontificate, we may add the most savage ferocity, the most audacious arrogance, the most despotic vehemence of temper, and the most extravagant and frenetic passion for war and blood-shed. He began his military enterprizes by entering into a war with the Venetians, after having strengthened his cause by an alliance with the emperor and the king of *France* [d]. He afterwards laid siege to *Ferrara*; and, at length, turned his arms against

Julius II.

[c] See the *Life of Alexander VI*, in two volumes 8^{vo}. by ALEX. GORDON, Esq.—As also another life of the same pontif, written with more moderation, and subjoined, along with that of LEO X, to the first volume of the learned and ingenious work, intituled, *Histoire du Droit public Ecclesiastique François*, par M. D. B. published in 4^{to}. at London, in 1752.

[d] See Du Bos *Histoire de la Ligue de Cambray*, published at the *Hague* in two volumes 8^{vo}. in the year 1710.

SENT. XVI. his former ally the French monarch, in conjunction with the Venetians, Spaniards, and Swiss, whom he had drawn into this war and engaged in his cause by an offensive league. His whole pontificate, in short, was one continued scene of military tumult; nor did he suffer *Europe* to enjoy a moment's tranquillity as long as he lived. We may easily imagine the miserable condition of the church under a vicar of CHRIST who lived in camps, amidst the din of arms, and who was ambitious of no other fame than that which arose from battles won and cities laid desolate. Under such a pontif all things must have gone to ruin; the laws must have been subverted, the discipline of the church destroyed, and the genuine lustre of true religion entirely effaced.

The council of
Pisa.

VI. Nevertheless, from this dreadful cloud that hung over *Europe*, some rays of light seemed to break forth that promised a better state of things, and gave some reason to expect that reformation in the church, that was so ardently and so universally desired. LEWIS XII, king of *France*, provoked by the insults he had received from this arrogant pontif, meditated revenge, and even caused a medal to be struck with a menacing inscription, expressing his resolution to overturn the power of *Rome*, which was represented by the title of *Babylon* on this coin [e]. Several cardinals also, encouraged by the protection of this monarch and the emperor MAXIMILIAN I, assembled, in the year 1511, a council at *Pisa*, with an intention to set bounds to the tyranny of this furious pontif, and to correct and reform the errors and corruptions of a superstitious church. JULIUS, on the other hand, relying on his own strength, and on the power of his allies, beheld these threatening appearances without the least concern, nay, treated them with mockery and laughter. He did not, however, neglect the methods of rendering ineffectual the efforts of his enemies, that prudence dictated; and therefore gave orders for a council to meet in the palace of the Lateran in the year 1512 [f], in which the decrees of the council of *Pisa* were condemned and annulled in the most injurious and insulting terms. This condemnation would, undoubtedly, have been followed with the most dire and formidable *anathemas* against LEWIS and other princes, had not death snatched away this audacious pontif, in the year 1512, in the midst of his ambitious and vindictive projects.

Leo X.

VII. He was succeeded, in the year 1513, by LEO X, of the family of *Medicis*, who, though of a milder disposition than his predecessor, was, nevertheless, equally indifferent about the interests of religion and the advancement of true piety. He was a protector of men of learning, and was himself learned as far as the darkness of the age would admit of. His time was divided between conversation with men of letters, and pleasure;

[e] See B. CHRIST. SIGISMUND. LIEBII *Commentatio de numis Ludovici XII, Epigraphe, PERDAM BABYLONIS NOMEN, insignibus*; Lipsie 1717.—See also *Thesaurus Epistolicus Croxianus*, tom. i. p. 238. 243.—COLONIA, *Histoire Litter. de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 443.—The authenticity and occasion of this medal have been much disputed, and, as is well known, have afforded matter of keen debate.

[f] HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. ix. p. 1559.

though it must be observed, that the greatest part of it was consecrated to the latter. He had an invincible aversion to whatever was accompanied with solicitude and care, and discovered the greatest impatience under events of that nature. He was remarkable for his prodigality, luxury, and imprudence, and has even been charged with impiety, if not atheism. He did not, however, neglect the grand object which the generality of his predecessors had so much at heart, even the promoting and advancing the opulence and grandeur of the Roman see. For he took the utmost care that nothing should be transacted in the council of the Lateran which JULIUS had assembled and left sitting, that had the least tendency to favour the *Reformation* of the church. He went still farther; and, in a conference which he had with FRANCIS I, king of France, at Bologna, he engaged that monarch to abrogate the *Pragmatic Sanction* [g], which had been so long odious to the popes of Rome, and to substitute in its place another body of laws more advantageous to the papacy, which were imposed upon his subjects under the title of *Concordates*, and received with the utmost indignation and reluctance [h].

[g] We have mentioned this *Pragmatic Sanction*, Cent. XV. Part II. Chap. II. § XVI. Note [g], and given there some account of its nature and design. This important edict is published at large in the VIIIth volume of the *Concilia* HARDUINI, p. 1949. as is the *Concordate*, that was substituted in its place, in the IXth volume of the same work, p. 1867. and in LEIBNITZ, his *Manifèste Codicis Diplomat.* part. I. p. 158. part. II. p. 358.—The history of these two pieces is given in an ample and accurate manner by bishop BURNET, in his *History of the Reformation*, vol. iii. p. 3.—See also, on the same subject, DE BOULAY *Histoire Académ. Paris.* tom. vi. p. 61—109. DU CLOS *Histoire de Louis XI.*—*Histoire du Droit Ecclesiastique François*, tom. i. Diff. ix. p. 415.—*Menagiana*, tom. iii. p. 285.

[(h)] The king went in person to the parliament to offer the *Concordate* to be registred, and letters patent were made out requiring all the judges and courts of justice to observe this Act, and see it executed. The parliament, after deliberating a month upon this important matter, concluded not to register the *Concordate*, but to observe still the *Pragmatic*, unless the former edict was received and established in as great an assembly as that was, which published the latter in the reign of CHARLES VII. And when by violence and force they were obliged to publish the *Concordate*, they joined to this publication a solemn protest, and an appeal from the pope to the next general council, into both which measures the university and the clergy entered with the greatest alacrity and zeal. But royal and papal despotism at length prevailed.

The chancellor DE PRAT, who was principally concerned in promoting the *Concordate*, has been generally regarded as an enemy to the liberties of the Gallican church. The illustrious and learned president HAINAULT has not, however, hesitated to defend his memory against this accusation, and to justify the *Concordate* as an equitable contract, and as a measure attended with less inconveniencies than the *Pragmatic Sanction*. He observes, that by the king's being invested, by the *Concordate*, with the privilege of nominating to the bishoprics and vacant benefices of the first class, many corruptions and abuses were prevented, which arose from the simoniacal practices, that prevailed almost every where, while, according to the *Pragmatic Sanction*, every church chose its bishop, and every monastery its abbot. He observes moreover, that this nomination was the natural right of the crown, as the most considerable part of the great benefices had been created by the kings of France; and he insists particularly on this consideration, that the right, which Christian communities have to chuse their leaders, cannot be exercised by such large bodies without much confusion and many inconveniencies, and that the subjects by entrusting their sovereign with the government of the state, invest him *ipso facto* with an authority over the church, which is a part of the state and its noblest branch. See HAINAULT *Abregé Chronologique de l'Histoire de France*, in the *Particular Remarks* that are placed at the end of the reign of LEWIS XIV.

The most specious objection that was made to the *Concordate* was this: that, in return for the nomination to the vacant benefices, the king granted to the popes the *annates*, or *first fruits*, which

CENT. XVI.

The avarice of
the popes.

VIII. The raging thirst of dominion that consumed these pontifs, and their arrogant endeavours, to crush and oppress all that came within the reach of their power, were accompanied with the most insatiable avarice. All the provinces of *Europe* were, in a manner, drained to enrich these ghostly tyrants, who were perpetually gaping after new accessions of wealth, in order to augment the number of their friends and the stability of their dominion. And, indeed, according to the notions commonly entertained, the rulers of the church seemed to have a fair enough pretext, from the nature of their character, to demand a sort of tribute from their flock; for none can deny to the supreme governors of any state (and such was the character assumed by the popes) the privilege of levying tribute from those, over whom they bear rule. But as the name of *tribute* was every way proper to alarm the jealousy and excite the indignation of the civil magistrate, the pontifs were too cunning to employ it, and had recourse to various stratagems and contrivances to rob the subject without shocking the sovereign, and to levy taxes under the specious mask and pretext of religion. Among these contrivances, the distribution of *indulgences*, which enabled the wealthy to purchase impunity for their crimes by certain sums applied to religious uses, held an eminent rank. This traffic of *indulgences* was constantly renewed whenever the coffers of the church were exhausted. On these occasions, they were recommended warmly to the ignorant multitude under some new, specious, yet fallacious pretext, and were greedily sought after to the great detriment both of individuals and of the community.

The pope's authority held inferior to that of a council.

IX. Notwithstanding the veneration and homage that were almost every where paid to the Roman pontifs, they were far from being universally reputed infallible in their decisions, or unlimited in their authority. The wiser part of the German, French, Flemish, and British nations considered them, as liable to error and bounded by law. The councils of *Constance* and *Basil* had contributed extremely to rectify the notions of the people in that respect; and from that period all Christians, except the superstitious monks and parasites of *Rome*, were persuaded that the pope was subordinate to a general council, that his decrees were not infallible, and that the council had a right to depose him, whenever he was convicted of gross errors or enormous crimes. Thus were the people, in some measure, prepared for the reformation of the church; and hence that ardent desire, that earnest expectation of a general council which filled the minds of the wisest and best Christians in this century. Hence also those frequent appeals that were made to this approaching council, when the court of *Rome* issued out any new edict, or made any new attempt repugnant to the dictates of piety and justice.

had so long been complained of as an intolerable grievance. There is, however, no mention of this equivalent in the *Concordate*. And it was by a papal bull that succeeded this compact, that the pontifs claimed the payment of the *first fruits*, of which they had put themselves in possession in the year 1316, and which had been suspended by the *Pragmatic Sanction*. See the *Histoire du Droit Ecclesiastique Francois*. As this substitution of the *Concordate*, in the place of the *Pragmatic Sanction*, was a most important transaction, and had a very great influence upon the minds of the English, the translator judged it necessary to give here some account of that matter.]

X. The

X. The licentious examples of the Pontiffs were zealously imitated in the lives and manners of the subordinate rulers and ministers of the church. The greatest part of the bishops and canons passed their days in dissolute mirth and luxury, and squandered away, in the gratification of their lusts and passions, the wealth that had been set apart for religious and charitable purposes. Nor were they less tyrannical than voluptuous; for the most despotic princes never treated their vassals with more rigour and severity, than these ghostly rulers employed towards all such as were under their jurisdiction. The decline of virtue among the clergy was attended with the loss of the public esteem, and the most considerable part of that once-respected body became, by their sloth and avarice, their voluptuousness and impurity, their ignorance and levity, contemptible and infamous, not only in the eye of the wise and good, but also in the universal judgment of the multitude [i]. Nor could the case be otherwise as matters were now constituted, for as all the offices and dignities of the church were become *venal* every where, the way of preferment was inaccessible to merit, and the wicked and licentious were rendered capable of rising to the highest ecclesiastical honours.

The corruption
of the lower or-
ders of the
clergy.

XI. The prodigious swarms of monks, that overspread *Europe*, were universally considered as cumberers of the ground, and occasioned murmurs and complaints every where. And, nevertheless, such was the genius of the age, of an age that was but just emerging from the thickest gloom of ignorance, and was suspended, as it were, in a dubious situation between darkness and light, that these monastic drones would have remained undisturbed, had they taken the least pains to preserve any remains even of the external air of decency and religion, that used to distinguish them in former times. But the Benedictine and the other monkish fraternities, who were invested with the privilege of possessing certain lands and revenues, broke through all restraint, made the worst possible use of their opulence, and, forgetful of the gravity of their character and of the laws of their order, rushed headlong into the shameless practice of vice in all its various kinds and degrees. On the other hand, the Mendicant orders, and especially those who followed the rule of St. DOMINICK and St. FRANCIS, though they were not carried away with the torrent of licentiousness that was overwhelming the church, yet they lost their credit in a different way; for their rustic impudence, their ridiculous superstitions, their ignorance, cruelty, and brutish manners alienated from them the minds of the people, and diminished their reputation from day to day. They had the most barbarous aversion to the arts and sciences, and expressed a like abhorrence of certain eminent and learned men, who endeavoured to open the paths of science to the pursuits of the studious youth, recommended the culture of the mind, and attacked the barbarism of the age in their writings and in their discourse. This is sufficiently evident from what happened to REUCHLINUS, ERASMUS, and other learned men.

The state of the
monastic orders.

[i] See CORNELII AURELII GAUDANI *Apocalypsis, seu Visio Mirabilis super miserabili Statu Matris Ecclesiae*, in CASPAR. BURMANNI *Analect. Hist. de Hadriano VI.* p. 245. printed in 4^{to} at Utrecht, in 1727.

CENT. XVI.

The Dominicans.

XII. Among all the monastic orders none enjoyed a higher degree of power and authority than the Dominican friars, whose credit was great, and their influence universal. This will not appear at all surprizing when we consider that they filled very eminent stations in the church, presided every where over the terrible tribunal of the *inquisition*, and had the care of souls, with the function of *confessors* in all the courts of *Europe*; a circumstance this which, in these times of ignorance and superstition, manifestly tended to put the most of the European princes in their power. But, notwithstanding all this credit and authority, the Dominicans had their enemies; and about this time their influence began to decline. Nay, several marks of perfidy, that appeared in the measures they employed to extend their authority, exposed them justly to the public indignation. Nothing more infamous than the frauds they practised to accomplish their purposes, as may be seen, among other examples, by the tragedy they acted at *Bern* in the year 1509 [k]. They were perpetually employed in stigmatizing, with the opprobrious mark of *Heresy*, numbers of learned and pious men, in

[(k) This most impious fraud is recorded at length by RUCHAT, at the end of the vith volume of his *Histoire de la Reformation en Suisse*; and also by HOTTINGER, in his *Hist. Eccles. Helvet.* tom. i. p. 334. There is also a compendious, but distinct narration of this infernal stratagem, in bishop BURNET's *Travels through France, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland*, p. 31. The stratagem in question was the consequence of a rivalry between the Franciscans and Dominicans, and more especially of their controversy concerning the *Immaculate Conception* of the Virgin MARY. The former maintained, that she was born without the blemish of *Original Sin*; the latter asserted the contrary. The doctrine of the Franciscans, in an age of darkness and superstition, could not but be popular; and hence the Dominicans lost ground from day to day. To support the credit of their Order, they resolved, at a chapter held at *Vimpsen* in the year 1504, to have recourse to fictitious visions and dreams, in which the people at that time had an easy faith; and they determined to make *Bern* the scene of their operations. A person named JETZER, who was extremely simple, and much inclined to austerities, and who had taken their habit as a lay-brother, was chosen as the instrument of the delusions they were contriving. One of the four Dominicans, who had undertaken the management of this plot, conveyed himself secretly into JETZER's cell, and about midnight appeared to him in a horrid figure, surrounded with howling dogs, and seeming to blow fire from his nostrils, by the means of a box of combustibles which he held near his mouth. In this frightful form he approached JETZER's bed, told him that he was the ghost of a Dominican, who had been killed at *Paris*, as a judgment of heaven for laying aside his monastic habit; that he was condemned to purgatory for this crime, adding, at the same time, that, by his means, he might be rescued from his misery which was beyond expression. This story, accompanied with horrible cries and howlings, frightened poor JETZER out of the little wits he had, and engaged him to promise to do all that was in his power to deliver the Dominican from his torment. Upon this, the impostor told him, that nothing but the most extraordinary mortifications, such as the *Discipline of the Whip* performed during eight days by the whole monastery, and JETZER's lying prostrate in the form of one crucified in the chapel during mass, could contribute to his deliverance. He added, that the performance of these mortifications would draw down upon JETZER the peculiar protection of the Blessed Virgin, and concluded by saying, that he would appear to him again accompanied with two other spirits. Morning was no sooner come than JETZER gave an account of this apparition to the rest of the convent, who all unanimously advised him to undergo the discipline that was enjoined him, and every one consented to bear his share of the task imposed. The deluded simpleton obeyed, and was admired as a saint by the multitudes that crowded about the convent, while the four friars, that managed the imposture, magnified, in the most pompous manner, the miracle of this apparition in their sermons and in their discourse. The night after, the apparition was renewed with the addition of two impostors, dressed like devils, and JETZER's faith was augmented by hearing from the spectre all the secrets of his life and thoughts, which the impostors had learned from his confessor. In this and some subsequent scenes (the detail of whose enormities, encroaching

encroaching upon the rights and properties of others to augment their possessions, and in laying the most iniquitous snares and stratagems for the

CENT. XVI.

for the sake of brevity we shall here omit) the impostor talked much to JETZER of the Dominican order, which he said was peculiarly dear to the Blessed Virgin; he added, that the Virgin knew herself to be conceived in *Original Sin*; that the doctors who taught the contrary were in purgatory; that the Blessed Virgin abhorred the Franciscans for making her equal with her son; and that the town of *Bern* would be destroyed for harbouring such plagues within her walls. In one of these apparitions JETZER imagined, that the voice of the spectre resembled that of the prior of the convent, and he was not mistaken; but, not suspecting a fraud, he gave little attention to this. The prior appeared in various forms, sometimes in that of St. *Barbara*, at others in that of St. *Bernard*, at length he assumed that of the Virgin MARY, and, for that purpose, cloathed himself in the habits that were employed to adorn the statue of the Virgin in the great festivals; the little images, that on these days are set on the altars, were made use of for angels, which, being tied to a cord that passed through a pulley over JETZER's head, rose up and down, and danced about the pretended Virgin to increase the delusion. The Virgin, thus equipped, addressed a long discourse to JETZER, in which, among other things, she told him, that she was conceived in *original Sin*, though she had remained but a short time under that blemish. She gave him, as a miraculous proof of her presence, a *host*, or consecrated wafer, which turned from white to red in a moment, and after various visits, in which the greatest enormities were transacted, the *Virgin-prior* told JETZER, that she would give him the most affecting and undoubted marks of her son's love, by imprinting on him the *five wounds* that pierced JESUS on the cross, as she had done before to St. *Lucia* and St. *Catharine*. Accordingly she took his hand by force, and struck a large nail through it, which threw the poor dupe into the greatest torment. The next night this masculine virgin brought, as he pretended, some of the linen in which Christ had been buried, to soften the wound, and gave JETZER a soporific draught, which had in it the blood of an unbaptized child, some grains of incense and of consecrated salt, some quicksilver, the hairs of the eye-brows of a child, all which, with some stupifying and poisonous ingredients, were mingled together by the prior with magic ceremonies, and a solemn dedication of himself to the devil in hope of his succour. This draught threw the poor wretch into a sort of lethargy, during which the monks imprinted on his body the other four wounds of Christ in such a manner that he felt no pain. When he awakened he found, to his unspeakable joy, these impressions on his body, and came at last to fancy himself a representative of Christ in the various parts of his passion. He was, in this state, exposed to the admiring multitude on the principal altar of the convent to the great mortification of the *Franciscans*. The *Dominicans* gave him some other draughts, that threw him into convulsions, which were followed by a voice conveyed through a pipe into the mouths of two images, one of MARY, and another of the child JESUS, the former of which had tears painted upon its cheeks in a lively manner. The little Jesus asked his mother, by means of this voice (which was that of the prior's) why she wept? and she answered, that her tears were owing to the impious manner in which the *Franciscans* attributed to *her* the honour that was due to *him*, in saying that she was conceived and born without sin.

The apparitions, false prodigies, and abominable stratagems of these Dominicans were repeated every night, and the matter was at length so grossly over-acted, that, simple as JETZER was, he at last discovered it, and had almost killed the prior, who appeared to him one night in the form of the Virgin with a crown on her head. The Dominicans fearing, by this discovery, to lose the fruits of their imposture, thought the best method would be to own the whole matter to JETZER, and to engage him, by the most seducing promises of opulence and glory, to carry on the cheat. JETZER was persuaded, or at least appeared to be so. But the Dominicans suspecting that he was not entirely gained over, resolved to poison him; but his constitution was so vigorous, that, though they gave him poison five several times, he was not destroyed by it. One day they sent him a loaf prepared with some spices, which, growing green in a day or two, he threw a piece of it to a wolf's whelps that were in the monastery, and it killed them immediately. At another time they poisoned the *host*, or consecrated wafer, but, as he vomited it up soon after he had swallowed it, he escaped once more. In short, there were no means of securing him, which the most detestable impiety and barbarity could invent that they did not put in practice, till finding at last an opportunity of getting out of the convent, he threw himself into the hands of the magistrates, to whom he made a full discovery of this infernal plot. The affair being brought to *Rome*, commissaries were sent from thence to examine the matter, and the whole cheat being fully proved, the four friars

CENT. XVI. destruction of their adversaries [1]. And they were the principal counsellors by whose instigation and advice LEO X was determined to that most rash and imprudent measure, even the public condemnation of LUTHER.

The state of
learning, and of
the public
schools.

XIII. The principal places in the public schools of learning were filled very frequently by monks of the Mendicant orders. This unhappy circumstance prevented their emerging from that ignorance and darkness, which had so long enveloped them, and it also rendered them inaccessible to that auspicious light of improved science, whose salutary beams had already been felt in several of the European provinces. The instructors of youth, dignified with the venerable titles of *Artists*, *Grammarians*, *Physicians*, and *Dialecticians*, loaded the memories of their laborious pupils with a certain quantity of barbarous terms, arid and senseless distinctions, and scholastic precepts delivered in the most inelegant style; and all such as could repeat this jargon with a certain readiness and rapidity, were considered as men of uncommon eloquence and erudition. The whole body of the philosophers extolled ARISTOTLE beyond all measure; while scarcely any studied him, and none understood him. For what was now exhibited, as the philosophy of that famous Grecian sage, was really nothing more than a confused and motley heap of obscure notions, sentences, and divisions, which even the public doctors and heads of schools were unable to comprehend. And, if among these thorns of scholastic wisdom there was any thing that had the appearance of fruit, it was crushed and blasted by the furious wranglings and disputes of the *Scotists* and *Thomists*, the *Realists* and *Nominalists*, whose clamours and contentions were unhappily heard in all the European academies.

The state of
theology.

XIV. The wretched and senseless manner of teaching theology in this century, may be learned from many books yet extant, which were wrote by the divines it produced, and which, in reality, have no other merit than their enormous bulk. The expositors of the holy scriptures were very few in number, during this century; and there were scarcely any of the Christian doctors that had a critical knowledge of the sacred oracles. This kind of knowledge was so rare, that, when LUTHER arose, there could not be found, even in the university of *Paris*, which was considered as the first and most famous of all the public schools of learning, a single person qualified to dispute with him, or oppose his doctrine, upon a scripture foundation. Any commentators, that were at this time to be found, were such, as, laying aside all attention to the native meaning and force of the words of scripture,

were solemnly degraded from their priesthood, and were burnt alive on the last day of May, 1509. JETZER died some time after at *Constance*, having poisoned himself, as was believed by some. Had his life been taken away before he had found an opportunity of making the discovery already mentioned, this execrable and horrid plot, which in many of its circumstances was conducted with art, would have been handed down to posterity as a stupendous miracle. This is a very brief account of the matter; such as are desirous of a more circumstantial relation of this famous imposture, may consult the authors mentioned in the beginning of this note.]

[1] See BILIB. PIRKHEIMERI *Epistola ad Hadrianum Pontif. Maxim. de Dominicanorum flagitiis*, in *Opp. ejus*, p. 372. This letter is also to be found in GERDESII *Introd. ad Hist. Renovati Evangelii*, tom. i. p. 170. Append.

which

which their profound ignorance of the original languages and of the rules of CENT. XVI. criticism rendered them incapable of investigating, gave a loose to their vain and irregular fancies in the pursuit of mysterious significations. The greatest part of the public teachers belonged to these classes of divines, which we have formerly mentioned under the titles of *Positivi* and *Sententarii*, who were extremely fond, the *former* of loading their accounts both of the truths and precepts of religion, with multiplied quotations and authorities from the writing of the ancient doctors; the *latter* of explaining the doctrines of the gospel by the rules of a subtle and intricate philosophy.

XV. It must, at the same time, be observed, that the divines of this century disputed with a good deal of freedom upon religious subjects, and even upon those that were looked upon as most essential to salvation. There were several points of doctrine which had not been, as yet, fixed and determined by the authority of the church; nor did the pontiffs, without some very urgent reason, restrain the right of private judgment, or force the consciences of men, except in those cases, where doctrines were adopted, that seemed detrimental to the supremacy of the apostolic see, or to the temporal interests of the sacerdotal and monastic orders. Hence it is, that we could mention many Christian doctors before LUTHER, who inculcated, not only with impunity, but even with applause, the very same tenets that afterwards drew upon him such heavy accusations and such bitter reproaches. And it is beyond all doubt, that this great reformer might have propagated these opinions without any danger or molestation, had he not pointed his warm remonstrances against the opulence of *Rome*, the overgrown fortunes of the bishops, the majesty of the pontiffs, and the towering ambition of the Dominicans.

The liberty of debating religious subjects.

XVI. The public worship of the Deity was now no more than a pompous round of external ceremonies, the greatest part of which were insignificant and senseless; and much more adapted to dazzle the eyes than to touch the heart. The number of those, who were at all qualified to administer public instruction to the people, was not very considerable; and their discourses, which contained little else than fictitious reports of miracles and prodigies, insipid fables, wretched quibbles, and illiterate jargon, deceived the multitude instead of instructing them. Several of these sermons are yet extant, which it is impossible to read without the highest indignation and contempt. Those who, on account of their gravity of manners, or their supposed superiority in point of wisdom and knowledge, held the most distinguished rank among these vain declaimers, had a commonplace set of subjects allotted to them, on which they were constantly exercising the force of their lungs and the power of their eloquence. These subjects were, the authority of the holy mother church, and the obligations of obedience to her decisions; the virtues and merits of the saints and their credit in the court of heaven; the dignity, glory, and love of the blessed Virgin; the efficacy of relicks; the duty of adorning churches, and endowing monasteries; the necessity of good works (as that phrase was then understood) to salvation; the intolerable burnings of *purgatory*, and the utility of
indulgences.

The nature of religious worship, as it was celebrated at this time.

CENT. XVI. *indulgences.* Such were the subjects that employed the zeal and labours of the most eminent doctors of this century; and they were, indeed, the only subjects that could tend to fill the coffers of the *good old mother church*, and advance her temporal interests. A ministry, who would have taken it into their heads to inculcate the doctrines and precepts of the gospel, to exhibit the example of its divine author and the efficacy of his mediation as the most powerful motives to righteousness and virtue, and to represent the love of God and mankind as the great duties of the Christian life, such a ministry would have been very unprofitable servants to the church and to the papacy, however they might have promoted the cause of virtue and the salvation of souls.

The corrupt and miserable condition of the people in general.

XVII. The state of things, that we have been now describing, exhibits to our view the true causes of that incredible ignorance in religious matters, which reigned universally in all countries and among all ranks and orders of men; an ignorance accompanied with the vilest forms of superstition, and the greatest corruption of manners. The clergy, who presided over the rites and ceremonies of the church, were far from shewing the least disposition to enlighten the ignorance or to check the superstition of the times; nay, instead of opposing, they rather nourished and promoted them as conducive to their safety and favourable to their interests. Nor was there more zeal shewn in stemming the torrent of immorality and licentiousness than in dispelling the clouds of superstition and ignorance. For the prudence of the church had easily foreseen, that the traffic of *indulgences* could not but suffer from a diminution of the crimes and vices of mankind, and that in proportion as virtue gained an ascendant upon the manners of the multitude, the profits arising from *expiations*, *satisfactions*, and such like ecclesiastical contrivances must necessarily decrease.

A reformation in the church ardently desired.

XVIII. Such then was the dismal condition of the church. Its corruption was compleat, and the abuses that it permitted were gone to the greatest height of enormity. But in proportion to the greatness of this corruption was the ardor and impatience, with which all, who were endowed with any tolerable portion of solid learning, genuine piety, or even good sense, desired to see the church reformed and purged from these shocking abuses. And the number of those, who were affected in this manner, was very considerable in all parts of the western world. The greatest part of them, indeed, were, perhaps, over-moderate in their demands. They did not extend their views so far as a change in the form of ecclesiastical government, a suppression of those doctrines, which, however absurd, had acquired a high degree of credit by their antiquity, nor even to the abrogation of those rites and ceremonies which had been multiplied in such an extravagant manner to the great detriment of true religion and rational piety. All they aimed at was to set limits to the overgrown power of the pontiffs, to reform the corrupt manners of the clergy, and to prevent the frauds that were too commonly practised by that order of men, to dispel the ignorance and correct the errors of the blinded multitude, and to deliver them from the heavy and unsupportable burthens that were imposed upon them under religious pretexts.

texts. But as it was impossible to obtain any of these salutary purposes CENT. XVI. without the suppression of various absurd and impious opinions from whence the grievances, complained of, sprung, and, indeed, without a general reformation of the religion that was publicly professed, so was this *reformation* supposed to be ardently, though silently, wished for by all those who publicly demanded the *reformation of the church in its head and in its members.*

XIX. If any sparks of real piety subsisted under this despotic empire of The Mystics. superstition, they were only to be found among the *Mystics*. For this sect, renouncing the subtilty of the schools, the vain contentions of the learned, with all the acts and ceremonies of external worship, exhorted their followers to aim at nothing but internal sanctity of heart, and communion with God the center and source of holiness and perfection. Hence the *Mystics* were loved and respected by many persons who had a serious sense of religion, and were of a tender and devotional complexion. But as they were not entirely free from the reigning superstitions, but associated many vulgar errors with their practical precepts and directions; and as their excessive passion for contemplation led them into many chimerical notions, and sometimes into a degree of fanaticism that approached to madness, more effectual succours than theirs were necessary to combat the inveterate errors of the times, and to bring about the reformation that was expected with such impatience.

CHAP. II.

The History of the Reformation, from its first beginnings to the confession, given in at Augsburg.

I. **W**HILE the Roman pontif slumbered in security at the head of the church, and saw nothing throughout the vast extent of his dominion but tranquillity and submission, and while the worthy and pious professors of genuine Christianity almost despaired of seeing that reformation on which their most ardent desires and expectations were bent, an obscure and inconsiderable person arose, on a sudden, in the year 1517, and laid the foundation of this long-expected change, by opposing, with undaunted resolution, his single force to the torrent of papal ambition and despotism. This extraordinary man was MARTIN LUTHER, a native of *Aisleben* in *Saxony*, a monk of the Augustinian *Eremites*, who were one of the Mendicant orders, and, at the same time, professor of divinity in the academy that had been erected at *Wittenberg*, a few years before this period, by FREDERICK the *Wise*. The papal chair was, at this time, filled by LEO X; MAXIMILIAN I, a prince of the house of *Austria*, was king of the Romans, and emperor of *Germany*; and FREDERICK, already mentioned, elector of *Saxony*. The bold efforts of this new adversary of the Pontiffs were honoured with the applauses of many, but few or none entertained hopes of their success. It seemed scarcely possible that this puny David could hurt a Goliath, whom so many heroes had opposed in vain.

The dawn of a reformation rises unexpectedly.

II. None

CENT. XVI.

Luther.

II. None of the qualities or talents that distinguished LUTHER were of a common or ordinary kind. His genius was truly great and unparalleled; his memory vast and tenacious; his patience in supporting trials, difficulties, and labour, incredible; his magnanimity invincible and independent on the vicissitudes of human affairs; and his learning most extensive, considering the age in which he lived. All this will be acknowledged even by his enemies, at least by such of them as are not totally blinded by a spirit of partiality and faction. He was deeply versed in the theology and philosophy that were in vogue in the schools during this century, and he taught them both with the greatest reputation and success in the academy of *Wittenberg*. As a philosopher, he embraced the doctrine of the *Nominalists*, which was the system adopted by his order; while, in divinity, he followed chiefly the sentiments of AUGUSTIN; but in both he preferred the decisions of Scripture and the dictates of right reason before the authority and opinions of fallible men. It would be equally rash and absurd to represent this great man as exempt from error and free from infirmities and defects; yet, if we except the contagious effects of the age in which he lived, and of the religion in which he had been brought up, we shall, perhaps, find but a few things in his character that render him liable to reproach [m].

Indulgences
preached up by
John Tetzel in
1517.

III. The first opportunity that this great man had of unfolding to the view of a blinded and deluded age, the truth, which had struck his astonished sight, was offered by a Dominican, whose name was JOHN TETZEL [n]. This bold and enterprising monk, had been chosen, on account of his uncommon impudence, by *Albert* archbishop of *Mentz* and *Magdeburg*, to preach and proclaim, in *Germany*, those famous indulgences of *LEO X*, which administered remission of all sins, past, present, and to come, however enormous their nature, to those who were rich enough to purchase them. The frontless monk executed this iniquitous commission not only with matchless insolence, indecency [o], and fraud, but even carried his impiety so far as to derogate from the all-sufficient power and influence of the merits of CHRIST. At this, LUTHER, unable to smother his just indignation, raised his warning voice, and, in ninety-five, maintained publicly at *Wittenberg*, on the 30th of September, in the year 1517, censured the extravagant extortion of these questors, and plainly pointed out the Roman pontif as a partaker of their guilt, since he suffered the people to be seduced by such delusions from placing their principal confidence in CHRIST, the only pro-

[m] The writers, who have given any circumstantial account of LUTHER, and his transactions, are accurately enumerated by JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Centifolium Lutherianum*, the first part of which was published at *Hamburg* in the year 1728, and the second in 1730, in 8^{vo}.

[n] The historians, who have particularly mentioned TETZEL, and his odious methods of deluding the multitude, are enumerated in the work quoted in the preceding note, part I. p. 47. part II. p. 530. — What is said of this vile deceiver by ECHARD and QUETIF, in the *Scriptores Ordin. Prædicator.* tom. ii. p. 40. discovers the blindest zeal and the meanest partiality.

[o] In describing the efficacy of these indulgences, TETZEL said, among other enormities, that even had any one ravished the mother of God, he (TETZEL) had wherewithal to efface his guilt. He also boasted, that he had saved more souls from hell by these INDULGENCES, than ST. PETER had converted to Christianity by his preaching.]

per object of their trust. This was the commencement and foundation of that memorable rupture and revolution in the church, which humbled the grandeur of the lordly pontiffs, and eclipsed so great a part of their glory [p].

[(p)] Dr. MOSHEIM has taken no notice of the calumnies invented and propagated by some late authors, in order to make LUTHER's zealous opposition to the publication of *Indulgences* appear to be the effect of selfish and ignoble motives. It may not, therefore, be improper to set that in a true light; not that the cause of the reformation (which must stand by its own intrinsic dignity, and is, in no way, affected by the views or characters of its instruments) can derive any strength from this inquiry, but as it may tend to vindicate the personal character of a man, who has done eminent service to the cause of religion.

Mr. HUME, in his *History of the Reign of HENRY VIII.*, has thought proper to repeat what the enemies of the reformation, and some of its dubious or ill-informed friends, have advanced with respect to the motives that engaged LUTHER to oppose the doctrine of indulgences. This elegant and persuasive historian tells us, that the *Austin friars* had usually been employed in Saxony to preach *Indulgences*, and from this trust had derived both profit and consideration; that *Arcembold* gave this occupation to the *Dominicans**; that *Martin Luther*, an *Austin friar*, professor in the university of *Wittenberg*, RESENTING THE AFFRONT PUT UPON HIS ORDER, began to preach against the abuses that were committed in the sale of indulgences, and, being provoked by opposition, proceeded even to decry indulgences themselves†. It were to be wished, that Mr. HUME's candor had engaged him to examine this accusation better, before he had determined to repeat it. For, in the first place, it is not true, that the *Austin friars* had been usually employed in Saxony to preach indulgences. It is well known, that that commission had been offered alternately, and sometimes jointly to all the Mendicants, whether *Austin friars*, *Dominicans*, *Franciscans*, or *Carmelites*. Nay, from the year 1229, that lucrative commission was principally intrusted with the *Dominicans*‡; and in the records, which relate to indulgences, we rarely meet with the name of an *Austin friar*, and not one single act by which it appears that the Roman pontiff ever named the friars of that Order to the office under consideration. More particularly it is remarkable, that, for half a century before LUTHER (i. e. from 1450 to 1517) during which period indulgences were sold with the most scandalous marks of avaritious extortion and impudence, we scarcely meet with the name of an *Austin friar* employed in that service; if we except a monk, named *Palzius*, who was no more than an underling of the papal questor *RAYMOND PERALDUS*; so far is it from being true, that the *Augustine* order were exclusively, or even usually, employed in that service||. Mr. HUME has built his assertion upon the sole authority of a single expression of *PAUL SARPI*, which has been abundantly refuted by *De Priore*, *Pallavicini*, and *Graveson*, the mortal enemies of LUTHER. — But it may be alledged, that, even supposing it was not usual to employ the *Augustine* friars alone in the propagation of indulgences, yet LUTHER might be offended at seeing such an important commission given to the *Dominicans* exclusively, and that, consequently, this was his motive in opposing the propagation of indulgences. To shew the injustice of this allegation, I observe

Secondly, That in the time of LUTHER, the preaching of indulgences was become such an odious and unpopular matter, that it is far from being probable, that LUTHER would have been solicitous about obtaining such a commission either for himself or for his Order. The princes of Europe, with many bishops, and multitudes of learned and pious men, had opened their eyes upon the turpitude of this infamous traffic; and even the *Franciscans* and *Dominicans*, towards the conclusion of the fifteenth century, opposed it publicly, both in their discourses and in their writings§. Nay more, the very commission which is supposed to have excited the envy of LUTHER, was offered by LEO to the general of the *Franciscans*, and was refused both by him and his Order**, who gave it over entirely to ALBERT bishop of *Mentz* and *Magdeburg*. Is it then to be imagined, that either LUTHER or the other *Austin* friars aspired after a commission of which the *Franciscans* were ashamed? Besides, it is a mistake to affirm, that this office was given to the *Dominicans* in general; since it

* HUME's *History of England, under the House of Tudor*, vol. i. p. 119.

† Id. lb. p. 120.

‡ See WEISMANNI *Memorabilia Historiae Sacrae* N. T. p. 1051, 1113.

§ See HAPPII *Dissertation de Nonnullis Indulgentiarum*, Sac. xiv et xv. *Quaestibus*, p. 384, 387.

|| See WALCH, *Opp. Luther*, tom. xv. p. 114. 283. 212. 349. — SECKENDORF, *Hist. Lutheranismi*, lib. i. Sect. vi. p. 13.

¶ See WALCH, loc. cit. p. 371.

CENT. XVI.

The true state of
the debate be-
tween Luther
and Tetzel.

IV. This debate between LUTHER and TETZEL was, at first, a matter of no great moment, and might have been terminated with the utmost facility, had LEO X been disposed to follow the healing method which common prudence must have naturally pointed out on such an occasion. For after all, this was no more than a private dispute between two monks, concerning the extent of the pope's power with respect to the remission of sin. LUTHER confessed that the Roman pontif was clothed with the power of remitting the human punishments inflicted upon transgressors, *i. e.* the punishments denounced by the church and its visible head the bishop of Rome; but he strenuously denied that his power extended to the remission of the divine punishments allotted to offenders, either in this present, or in a future state; affirming, on the contrary, that these punishments could only be removed by the merits of CHRIST, or by voluntary acts of mortification and penance undertaken and performed by the transgressor. The doctrine of TETZEL was, indeed, directly opposite to the sentiments of LUTHER; for this senseless or designing monk asserted, that all punishments present and future, human and divine, were submitted to the authority of the Roman pontif, and came within the reach of his absolving power. This matter had often been debated before the present period; but the popes had always been prudent enough to leave it undecided. These debates, however, being sometimes treated with neglect, and, at others, carried on without

was given to TETZEL alone, an individual member of that Order, who had been notorious for his profligacy, barbarity, and extortion. But that neither resentment nor envy were the motives that led LUTHER to oppose the doctrine and publication of indulgences will appear with the utmost evidence, if we consider in the *Third* place,—That he was never accused of any such motives either in the edicts of the pontifs of his time, or amidst the other reproaches of the contemporary writers, who defended the cause of Rome, and who were far from being sparing of their invectives and calumnies. All the contemporary adversaries of LUTHER are absolutely silent on this head. From the year 1517 to 1546, when the dispute about indulgences was carried on with the greatest warmth and animosity, not one writer ever ventured to reproach LUTHER with these ignoble motives of opposition now under consideration. I speak not of Erasmus, Sleidan, De Thou, Guiccardini, and others, whose testimony might be perhaps suspected of partiality in his favour; but I speak of Cajetan, Hogstrat, De Prietio, Enser, and even the infamous John Tetzel, whom LUTHER opposed with such vehemence and bitterness. Even the lying Cochleus was silent on this head during the life of LUTHER; though, after the death of that great reformer, he broached the calumny I am here refuting. But such was the scandalous character of this man, who was notorious for fraud, calumny, lying, and their sister vices, that Pallavicini, Bassuet, and other enemies of LUTHER were ashamed to make use either of his name or testimony. Now, may it not be fairly presumed, that the contemporaries of LUTHER were better judges of his character and the principles from which he acted, than those who lived in after-times? Can it not be imagined, that motives to action, which escaped the prying eyes of LUTHER's contemporaries, should have discovered themselves to us who live at such a distance of time from the scene of action, to M. Bassuet, to M. Hume, and to other abettors of this ill-conceived and foolish story? Either there are no rules of moral evidence, or Mr. Hume's assertion is entirely groundless.

I might add many other considerations to shew the unreasonableness of supposing that LUTHER exposed himself to the rage of the Roman pontif, to the persecutions of an exasperated clergy, to the severity of such a potent and despotic prince as CHARLES V, to death itself, and that from a principle of avarice and ambition. But I have said enough to satisfy every candid mind.]

* SLEIDAN, *De Statu Rel. et Reip. in Dedic. Epist. ad August. Elector.*

wisdom, the seeds of discord gained imperceptibly new accessions of strength and vigour, and from small beginnings produced, at length, revolutions and events of the most momentous nature. CENT. XVI.

V. The sentiments of LUTHER were received with applause by the greatest part of *Germany*, which had long groaned under the avarice of the pontiffs and the extortions of their tax-gatherers, and had murmured grievously against the various stratagems, that were daily put in practice, with the most frontless impudence, to fleece the rich, and to grind the faces of the poor. But the votaries of *Rome* were filled with horror, when they were informed of the opinions propagated by the Saxon reformer; more especially the Dominicans, who looked upon their order as insulted and attacked in the person of TETZEL. The alarm of controversy was therefore founded, and TETZEL, himself, appeared immediately in the field against LUTHER, whose sentiments he pretended to refute in two academical discourses, which he pronounced on occasion of his promotion to the degree of doctor in divinity. In the year following (1518) two famous Dominicans, SYLVESTER DE PRIERIO and HOOGSTRAT, the former a native of *Italy*, and the latter a German, rose up also against the adventurous reformer, and attacked him at *Cologne* with the utmost vehemence and ardor. Their example was soon followed by another formidable champion, named ECKIUS, a celebrated professor of divinity at *Ingolstadt*, and one of the most zealous supporters of the Dominican order. LUTHER stood firm against these united adversaries, and was neither vanquished by their arguments, nor daunted by their talents and reputation; but answered their objections and refuted their reasonings with the greatest strength of evidence, and a becoming spirit of resolution and perseverance. At the same time, however, he addressed himself by letters, written, in the most submissive and respectful terms, to the Roman pontif and to several of the bishops, shewing them the uprightness of his intentions, as well as the justice of his cause, and declaring his readiness to change his sentiments, as soon as he should see them fairly proved to be erroneous.

The adversaries
of Luther and
the patrons of
Tetzel.

VI. At first, LEO X beheld this controversy with indifference and contempt: but, being informed by the emperor MAXIMILIAN I, not only of its importance, but also of the fatal divisions it was likely to produce in *Germany*, he summoned LUTHER to appear before him at *Rome*, and there to plead the cause which he had undertaken to maintain. This papal summons was superseded by FREDERICK the *Wise*, elector of *Saxony*, who pretended, that the cause of LUTHER belonged to the jurisdiction of a German tribunal, and that it was to be decided by the ecclesiastical laws of the empire. The pontif yielded to the remonstrances of this prudent and magnanimous prince, and ordered LUTHER to justify his intentions and doctrines before cardinal CAJETAN, who was, at this time, legate at the diet of *Augsburg*. In this first step the court of *Rome* gave a specimen of that temerity and imprudence with which all its negotiations, in this weighty affair, were afterwards conducted. For, instead of reconciling, nothing could tend more to inflame matters than the choice of CAJETAN, a Domi-

A conference is
held between
Luther and Ca-
jetan at *Augs-
burg*.

CENT. XVI.

The issue of this conference.

nican, and, consequently, the declared enemy of LUTHER, and friend of TETZEL, as judge and arbitrator in this nice and perilous controversy.

VII. LUTHER, however, repaired to *Augsburg*, in the month of October 1518, and conferred, at three different meetings, with CAJETAN himself [q], concerning the points in debate. But had he even been disposed to yield to the court of *Rome*, this imperious legate was, of all others, the most improper to engage him in the execution of such a purpose. The high spirit of LUTHER was not to be tamed by the arrogant dictates of mere authority; such, however, were the only methods of persuasion employed by the haughty cardinal. He, in an overbearing tone, desired LUTHER to renounce his opinions, without even attempting to prove them erroneous, and insisted, with importunity, on his confessing humbly his fault and submitting respectfully to the judgment of the Roman pontif [r]. The Saxon reformer could not think of yielding to terms so unreasonable in themselves and so despotically proposed; so that the conferences were absolutely without effect. For LUTHER, finding his adversary and judge inaccessible to reason and argument, left *Augsburg* all of a sudden, after having appealed from the present decisions of the pontif to those which he should pronounce, when better informed; and, in this step, he seemed yet to respect the dignity and authority of the bishop of *Rome* [s]. But LEO X, on the other hand, let loose the reins to ambition and despotism, and carried things to the utmost extremity; for, in the month of November, this same year, he published a special edict, commanding his spiritual subjects to acknowledge his power of delivering from all the punishments due to sin and transgression of every kind. As soon as LUTHER received information of this inconsiderate and violent measure, he perceived, plainly, that it would be impossible for him to bring the court of *Rome* to any reasonable terms; he therefore repaired to *Wittemberg*, and, on the 28th of November, appealed from the pontif to a general council.

The transactions of Miltitz.
All the projects of reconciliation disconcerted in 1519.

VIII. In the mean time the Roman pontif became sensible of the imprudence he had been guilty of in entrusting CAJETAN with such a commission, and endeavoured to mend the matter by employing a man of more candor and impartiality, and better acquainted with business, in order to suppress the rebellion of LUTHER, and to engage that reformer to submission and obedience. This new legate was CHARLES MILTITZ, a Saxon knight, who

[q] There is a large account of this cardinal given by QUETIF and ECHARD *Scriptor. Ordin. Prædicator.* tom. ii. p. 14.

[r] The imperious and imprudent manner in which CAJETAN behaved towards LUTHER was highly disapproved of even at the court of *Rome*, as appears, among other testimonies, from PAULO SARPI's *History of the Council of Trent*, book I. p. 22. The conduct of CAJETAN is defended by ECHARD, in his *Scriptor. Ord. Prædicator.* tom. ii. p. 15. But with little prudence, and less argument. The truth of the matter is, that the court of *Rome*, and its unthinking sovereign, were not less culpable than CAJETAN in the whole of this transaction. Since they might easily foresee, that a Dominican legate was of all others the most unlikely to treat LUTHER with moderation and impartiality, and consequently the most improper to reconcile matters.

[s] See B. CHRIST. FRID. BÖRNERI *Diss. de Colloquio Lutheri cum Cajetano*, Lips. 1722, in 4^{to}. VAL. ERN. LOSCHERI *Acta et Documenta Reformationis*, tom. ii. c. xi. p. 435. Opp. Lutheri, tom. xxiv. p. 409.

belonged.

belonged to the court of LEO X, and whose lay-character exposed him less CANT. XVI. to the prejudices that arise from a spirit of party, than if he had been cloathed with the splendid purple, or the monastic frock. He was also a person of great prudence, penetration, and dexterity, and every way qualified for the execution of such a nice and critical commission, as this was. Leo, therefore, sent him into Saxony to present to FREDERICK the golden, consecrated *rose* (which the pontiffs are used to bestow, as a peculiar mark of distinction, on those princes, for whom they have, or think proper to profess, an uncommon friendship and esteem) and to treat with LUTHER, not only about finishing his controversy with TETZEL, but also concerning the methods of bringing about a reconciliation between him and the court of Rome. Nor, indeed, were the negociations of this prudent minister entirely unsuccessful; for, in his first conference with LUTHER, at *Altenburg*, in the year 1519, he carried matters so far as to persuade him to write a submissive letter to LEO X, promising to observe a profound silence upon the matters in debate, provided, that the same obligation should be imposed upon his adversaries. This same year, in the month of October, MILTITZ had a second conference with LUTHER in the castle of *Liebenwerd*, and a third the year following, at *Lichtenberg* [t]. These meetings, which were reciprocally conducted with moderation and decency, gave great hopes of an approaching reconciliation; nor were these hopes ill founded [u]. But the violent proceedings of the enemies of LUTHER, and the arrogant spirit, as well as unaccountable imprudence of the court of Rome, blasted these fair expectations, and kindled anew the flames of discord.

[w] IX. It was sufficient barely to mention the measures taken by CAJETAN to draw LUTHER anew under the papal yoke; because these measures were, indeed, nothing more than the wild suggestions of superstition and tyranny, maintained and avowed with the most frontless impudence. A man, who began by commanding the reformer to renounce his errors, to believe, and that upon the dictates of mere authority, that *one drop of Christ's blood, being sufficient to redeem the whole human race, the remaining quantity, that was shed in the garden and upon the cross, was left as a legacy to the church, to be a treasure from whence indulgences were to be drawn and administered by the Roman pontiffs* [x]. Such a man was not to be reasoned with. But MILTITZ, pro-

The nature of the conferences between Miltitz and Luther.

[t] See B. CHRIST. ERID. B. The records, relating to the embassy of MILTITZ, were first published by ERN. SALOMON. CYPRIANUS, in *Addit. ad WILH. ERN. TENZELII Histor. Reformat.* tom. i. ii.—As also by VAL. ERN. LÖSCHERUS, in his *Acta Reformat.* tom. ii. c. xvi. & tom. iii. cap. ii.

[u] In the year 1519, LEO X wrote to LUTHER in the softest and most pacific terms. From this remarkable letter (which was published in the year 1742, by LÖSCHERUS, in a German work, intituled *Unschuld. Nachricht*) it appears, that at the court of Rome they looked upon a reconciliation between LUTHER and the pontif, as certain, and near at hand.

[w] This whole ninth section is added to Dr. MOSHEIM's work by the translator, who thought that this part of LUTHER's history deserved to be related in a more circumstantial manner, than it is in the original.]

[x] Such, among others, still more absurd, were the expressions of CAJETAN, which he borrowed from one of the *Decretals* of CLEMENT VI, called (and that justly for more than one reason) *Extravaganti*.]

ceeded.

CENT. XVI. ceded in quite another manner, and his conferences with the Saxon reformer are worthy of attention. He was ordered, indeed, to demand of the elector, that he would either oblige LUTHER to renounce the doctrines he had hitherto maintained, or, that he would withdraw from him his protection and favour. But perceiving, that he was received by the elector with a degree of coldness that bordered upon contempt, and that LUTHER's credit and cause were too far advanced to be destroyed by the efforts of mere authority, he had recourse to gentler methods. He loaded TETZEL with the bitterest reproaches, on account of the irregular and superstitious means he had employed for promoting the sale of indulgences, and attributed to this miserable wretch all the abuses that LUTHER had complained of. TETZEL, on the other hand, burthened with the iniquities of Rome, tormented with a consciousness of his own injustice and extortions, stung with the opprobrious censures of the new legate, and seeing himself equally despised and abhorred by both parties, died of grief and despair [y]. This incendiary, being sacrificed as a victim to cover the Roman pontif from reproach, MILTITZ entered into a particular conversation with LUTHER, at *Altenburg*, and, without pretending to justify the scandalous traffic in question, required only, that he would acknowledge the four following things: 1st, "That the people had been seduced by false notions of indulgences: " 2^{dly}, That he (LUTHER) had been the cause of that seduction, by representing indulgences as much more heinous than they really were: " 3^{dly}, That the odious conduct of TETZEL alone, had given occasion to " these representations: and 4^{thly}, That, though the avarice of ALBERT, " archbishop of *Mentz*, had set on TETZEL, yet, that this rapacious tax-gatherer had exceeded by far the bounds of his commission." These proposals were accompanied with many soothing words, with pompous encomiums on LUTHER's character, capacity, and talents, and with the softest and most pathetic expostulations in favour of union and concord in an afflicted and divided church; all which MILTITZ joined together with the greatest dexterity and address in order to touch and disarm the Saxon reformer. Nor were his mild and insinuating methods of negotiating without effect; and it was upon this occasion that LUTHER made submission, which shewed that his views were not, as yet, very extensive, his former prejudices entirely dispelled, or his reforming principles steddily fixed. For he not only offered to observe a profound silence for the future with respect to indulgences, provided the same condition were imposed on his adversaries; he went much farther; he proposed writing an humble and submissive letter to the pope, acknowledging that he had carried his zeal and animosity too far; and such a letter he wrote some time after the conference at *Altenburg* [z]. He even consented to publish a circular letter, exhorting

[(y) LUTHER was so affected by the agonies of despair under which TETZEL laboured, that he wrote him a pathetic letter of consolation, which, however, produced no effect. His infamy was perpetuated by a picture, placed in the church of *Pirna*, in which he is represented sitting on an ass, and selling indulgences.]

[(z) This letter was dated the 13th of March, 1519, about two months after the conference of *Altenburg*.]

all his disciples and followers to reverence and obey the dictates of the holy Roman church. He declared, that his only intention in the writings he had composed, was to brand with infamy those emissaries, who abused its authority, and employed its protection as a mask to cover their abominable and impious frauds. It is true, indeed, that amidst those weak submissions which the impartial demands of historical truth obligeth us to relate, there was, properly speaking, no retractation of his former tenets, nor the smallest degree of respect shewn to the infamous traffic of indulgences. Nevertheless, the pretended majesty of the Roman church, and the authority of the Roman pontif, were treated by LUTHER in this transaction and in his letter to LEO, in a manner that could not naturally have been expected from a man who had already appealed from the pope to a general council.

Had the court of *Rome* been prudent enough to have accepted of the submission made by LUTHER, they would have almost nipped, in the bud, the cause of the reformation, or would, at least, have considerably retarded its growth and progress. Having gained over the head, the members would, with greater facility, have been reduced to obedience. But the flaming and excessive zeal of some inconsiderate bigots renewed, happily for the truth, the divisions, which were so near being healed, and by animating both LUTHER and his followers to look deeper into the enormities that prevailed in the papal hierarchy, promoted the principles and augmented the spirit, which produced, at length, the blessed [a] reformation.

X. One of the circumstances that contributed principally, at least by its consequences, to render the embassy of MILTITZ ineffectual for the restoration of peace, was a famous controversy of an incidental nature that was carried on at *Leipfic*, some weeks successively, in the year 1519 [b]. A doctor, named ECKIUS, who was one of the most eminent and zealous champions in the papal cause, happened to differ widely from CARLOSTADT, the colleague and companion of LUTHER, in his sentiments concerning *Free-will*. The result of this variety in opinion was easy to be foreseen. The military genius of our ancestors had so far infected the schools of learning, that differences in points of religion or literature, when they grew to a certain degree of warmth and animosity, were decided, like the quarrels of valiant knights, by single combat. Some famous university was pitched upon as the field of battle, while the rector and professors beheld the contest, and proclaimed the victory. ECKIUS, therefore, in compliance with

The disputes at
Leipfic in the
year 1519, be-
tween Eckius
and Carlostadt.

[a] See, for an ample account of LUTHER's conferences with MILTITZ, the incomparable work of SECKENDORF, intituled, *Commentar. Histor. Apologet. de Lutheranism, sive de Reformatione Religionis*, &c. in which the facts relating to LUTHER and the reformation are deduced from the most precious and authentic manuscripts and records, contained in the library of *Saxe-Gotha*, and in other learned and princely collections, and in which, the frauds and falsehoods of MAIMBOURG's *History of Lutheranism* are fully detected and refuted.—As to MILTITZ, his fate was unhappy. His moderation (which nothing but the blind zeal of some furious monks could have hindered from being eminently serviceable to the cause of *Rome*) was represented by ECKIUS, as something worse than indifference about the success of his commission; and after several marks of neglect received from the pontif, he had the misfortune to lose his life in passing the *Rhine* at *Mentz*.]

[b] These disputes commenced on the 25th of June, and ended on the 15th of July following.
the

CENT. XVI. the spirit of this fighting age, challenged CARLOSTADT, and even LUTHER himself, against whom he had already drawn his pen, to try the force of his theological arms. The challenge was accepted, the day appointed, and the three champions appeared in the field. The first conflict was between CARLOSTADT and ECKIUS concerning the powers and freedom of the human will [c]; it was carried on in the castle of *Pleissenburg*, in presence of a numerous and splendid audience, and was followed by a dispute between LUTHER and ECKIUS concerning the authority and supremacy of the Roman pontif. This latter controversy, which the present situation of affairs rendered singularly nice and critical, was left undecided. HOFFMAN, at that time rector of the university of *Leipfic*, and, who had been also appointed judge of the arguments alledged on both sides, refused to declare to whom the victory belonged; so that the decision of this matter was referred to the universities of *Paris* and *Erfurt* [d]. In the mean time, one of the immediate effects of this dispute was a visible increase of the bitterness and enmity, which ECKIUS had conceived against LUTHER; for from this very period he breathed nothing but fury against the Saxon reformer [e], whom he marked out as a victim to his vengeance, without considering, that the measures he took for the destruction of LUTHER, must have a most pernicious influence upon the cause of the Roman pontif, by fomenting the present divisions, and thus contributing to the progress of the reformation; as was really the case.

Philip Melancthon.

XI. Among the spectators of this ecclesiastical combat was PHILIP MELANCTHON, at that time, professor of Greek at *Wittenberg*, who had not, as yet, been involved in these divisions (as indeed the mildness of his temper and his elegant taste for polite literature rendered him averse from disputes of this nature) though he was the intimate friend of LUTHER, and approved his design of delivering the pure and primitive science of theology from the

[c] This controversy, turned upon *liberty*, considered, not in a philosophical, but in a theological sense. It was rather a dispute concerning *power*, than concerning *liberty*. CARLOSTADT maintained, that, since the fall of man, our natural liberty is not strong enough to conduct us to what is good, without the intervention of divine grace. ECKIUS asserted, on the contrary, that our natural liberty co-operated with divine grace, and that it was in the power of man to consent to the divine impulse, or to resist it. The former attributed all to God; the latter divided the merit of virtue between God and the creature. The modern *Lutherans* have almost universally abandoned the sentiments of CARLOSTADT.]

[d] There is an ample account of this dispute at *Leipfic* given by VAL. ERN. LÖSCHERUS, in his *Acta et Documenta Reformationis*, tom. iii. c. vii. p. 203.

[e] This was one proof that the issue of the controversy was not in his favour. The victor, in any combat, is generally too full of satisfaction and self-complacency, to feel the emotions of fury and vengeance, which seldom arise but from disappointment and defeat. There is even an insolent kind of clemency that arises from an evident and palpable superiority. This, indeed, ECKIUS had no opportunity of exercising. LUTHER demonstrated, in this conference, that the church of *Rome*, in the earlier ages, had never been acknowledged as superior to other churches, and combatted the pretensions of that church and its bishop, from the testimony of scripture, the authority of the fathers, and the best ecclesiastical historians, and even from the decrees of the council of *Nice*; while all arguments of ECKIUS were derived from the spurious and impid *Decretals*, which were scarcely of 400 years standing. See SECKENDORFF'S *Hist. of Lutheranism*.]

darkness and subtilty of scholastic jargon [f]. As this eminent man was CENT. XVI. one of those, whom this dispute with Eckius convinced of the excellence of LUTHER'S cause; as he was, moreover, one of the illustrious and respectable instruments of the reformation; it may not be improper to give some account here of the talents and virtues that have rendered his name immortal. His greatest enemies have borne testimony to his merit. They have been forced to acknowledge, that the annals of antiquity exhibit very few worthies, that may be compared with him; whether we consider the extent of his knowledge in things human and divine, the fertility and elegance of his genius, the facility and quickness of his comprehension, or the uninterrupted industry that attended his learned and theological labours. He rendered to philosophy and the liberal arts the same eminent service that LUTHER had done to religion, by purging them from the dross with which they had been corrupted, and by recommending them, in a powerful and persuasive manner, to the study of the Germans. He had the rare talent of discerning truth in all its most intricate connexions and combinations, of comprehending, at once, the most abstract notions, and expressing them with the utmost perspicuity and ease. And he applied this happy talent in religious disquisitions with such unparalleled success, that it may safely be affirmed, that the cause of true Christianity derived from the learning and genius of MELANCTHON more signal advantages and a more effectual support, than it received from any of the other doctors of the age. His love of peace and concord, which was partly owing to the sweetness of his natural temper, made him desire, with ardor, that a reformation might be effected without producing a schism in the church, and that the external communion of the contending parties might be preserved uninterrupted and entire. This spirit of mildness and charity, carried perhaps too far, led him, sometimes, to make concessions that were neither consistent with prudence, nor advantageous to the cause in which he was engaged. It is, however, certain, that he gave no quarter to those more dangerous and momentous errors that reigned in the church of *Rome*, but maintained, on the contrary, that their extirpation was essentially necessary in order to the restoration of true religion. In the natural complexion of this great man there was something soft, timorous, and yielding. Hence arose a certain diffidence of himself, that not only made him examine things with the greatest attention and care before he resolved upon any measure, but also filled him with uneasy apprehensions where there was no danger, and made him fear even things that, in reality, could never happen. And yet, on the other hand, when the hour of real danger approached, when things bore a formidable aspect, and the cause of religion was in imminent peril, then this timorous man was converted, all at once, into an intrepid hero, looked danger in the face with unshaken constancy, and opposed his adversaries with invincible fortitude. All this shews, that the force of truth and the power of principle had diminished the weaknesses and defects of MELANCTHON'S natural character without entirely removing

[f] See MELANCTHON'S Letter concerning the conference at *Leipsic*, in LOSCHER'S *Acta et Documenta Reformationis*, tom. iii. cap. viii. p. 215.

CENT. XVI. them. Had his fortitude been more uniform and steady, his desire of reconciling all interests and pleasing all parties less vehement and excessive, his triumph over the superstitions imbibed in his infancy more compleat [g], he must deservedly have been considered, as one of the greatest among men [h].

The origin of
the reformation
in Switzerland.

XII. While the credit and authority of the Roman pontif were thus upon the decline in *Germany*, they received a mortal wound in *Switzerland*, from ULRIC ZUINGLE, a canon of *Zurich*, whose extensive learning and uncommon sagacity were accompanied with the most heroic intrepidity and resolution [i]. It must even be acknowledged [k], that this eminent man had perceived some rays of the truth before LUTHER came to an open rupture with the church of *Rome*. He was, however, afterwards still farther animated by the example and instructed by the writings of the Saxon reformer, and thus his zeal for the good cause acquired new strength and vigour. For he not only explained the sacred writings in his public discourses to the people [l], but also gave, in the year 1519, a signal proof of his courage, by opposing, with the greatest resolution and success, the ministry of a certain Italian monk, whose name was SAMSON, and who was carrying on, in *Switzerland*, the impious traffic of Indulgences with the same

[(g) By this no doubt Dr. MOSHEIM means the credulity this great man discovered with respect to prodigies and dreams, and his having been somewhat addicted to the pretended science of astrology.]

[(h) We have a Life of MELANCTHON, written by JOACHIM CAMERARIUS, which has already gone through several editions. But a more accurate account of this illustrious reformer, composed by a prudent, impartial, and well-informed biographer, as also a complete collection of his Works, would be an inestimable present to the republic of letters.]

[(i) The translator has added, to the portrait of ZUINGLE, the quality of *heroic intrepidity*, because it was a predominant and remarkable part of the character of this illustrious reformer, whose learning and fortitude, tempered by the greatest moderation, rendered him, perhaps, beyond comparison the brightest ornament of the protestant cause.]

[(k) Our learned historian does not seem to acknowledge this with pleasure, as the Germans and Swiss contend about the honour of having given the first overtures towards the reformation. If, however, truth has obliged him to make this acknowledgement, he has accompanied it with some modifications, that are more artful, than accurate. He says, "that ZUINGLE *had perceived some rays of the truth before LUTHER had come to an open rupture*," &c. to make us imagine that LUTHER might have seen the truth long before that rupture happened, and consequently as soon as ZUINGLE. But it is well known, that the latter, from his early years, had been shocked at several of the superstitious practices of the church of *Rome*: that, so early as the year 1516*, he had begun to explain the scriptures to the people, and to censure, though with great prudence and moderation, the errors of a corrupt church; and that he had very noble and extensive ideas of a general reformation, at the very time that LUTHER retained almost the whole system of popery, indulgences excepted. LUTHER proceeded very slowly to that exemption from the prejudices of education, which ZUINGLE, by the force of an adventurous genius and an uncommon degree of knowledge and penetration, easily got rid of.]

[(l) This again is inaccurate. It appears from the preceding note, and from the most authentic records of history, that ZUINGLE had explained the scriptures to the people, and called in question the authority and supremacy of the pope, before the name of LUTHER was known in *Switzerland*. Besides, instead of receiving instruction from the German reformer, he was much his superior in learning, capacity, and judgment, and was much fitter to be his *master* than his *disciple*, as the four volumes, in folio, we have of his works abundantly testify.]

* RUCHART Hist. de la Reformation en Suisse.—ZUINGELII Opp. tom. i. p. 7.—Nouveau Diction. vol. iv. p. 866.—DURAND Hist. du xvi. Siecle, tom. ii. p. 8, &c.

impudence that TETZEL had done in *Germany* [m]. This was the first remarkable event that prepared the way for the reformation among the Helvetic cantons. In process of time, ZUINGLE pursued, with steadiness and resolution, the design that he had begun with such courage and success. His noble efforts were seconded by some other learned men educated in *Germany*, who became his colleagues and the companions of his labours, and who, jointly with him, succeeded so far in removing the credulity of a deluded people, that the pope's supremacy was rejected and denied in the greatest part of *Switzerland*. It is, indeed, to be observed, that ZUINGLE did not always use the same methods of conversion that were employed by LUTHER; nor, upon particular occasions, did he discountenance the use of violent measures against such as adhered with obstinacy to the superstitions of their ancestors. He is also said to have attributed to the civil magistrate, such an extensive power in ecclesiastical affairs, as is quite inconsistent with the essence and genius of religion. But, upon the whole, even envy itself must acknowledge, that his intentions were upright, and his designs worthy of the highest approbation.

XIII. In the mean time, the religious dissensions in *Germany* increased, instead of diminishing. For while MILTITZ was treating with LUTHER in *Saxony*, in such a mild and prudent manner, as offered the fairest prospect of an approaching accommodation, ECKIUS, inflamed with resentment and fury on account of his defeat at *Leipsic*, repaired with the utmost precipitation to *Rome*, to accomplish, as he imagined, the ruin of LUTHER. There, entering into a league with the Dominicans, who were in high credit at the papal court, and more especially with their two zealous patrons, DE PRIERIO and CAJETAN, he earnestly entreated LEO X, to level the thunder of his *anathema's* at the head of LUTHER, and to exclude him from the communion of the church. The Dominicans, desirous of revenging the affront that, in their opinion, their whole order had received by LUTHER's treatment of their brother TETZEL and their patron CAJETAN, seconded the furious efforts of ECKIUS against the Saxon reformer, and used their utmost endeavours to have his request granted. The pontif, overcome by the importunity of these pernicious counsellors, imprudently issued [n] out a bull against LUTHER, dated the 15th of June 1520, in which forty-one pretended heresies, extracted from his writings, were solemnly condemned, his writings ordered to be publicly burnt, and in which he was again sum-

Luther is ex-communicated by the pope, in 1520.

[m] See JO. HENR. HOTTINGERI *Hist. Eccles. Helvet.* tom. ii. lib. vi. p. 28.—RUCHAT *Histoire de la Reformation en Suisse*, tom. i. livr. i. p. 4—66.—GERDES *Histor. Renovati Evangelii*, tom. ii. p. 228.

[n] The wisest and best part of the Roman catholics acknowledge, that LEO X was chargeable with the most culpable imprudence in this rash and violent method of proceeding. See a Dissertation of the learned JOHN FREDERICK MAYER, *De Pontificis Leonis X processum adversus Lutherum improbantibus*, which is part of a work he published at *Hamburg* in 4^{to} in the year 1698, under this singular title: *Ecclesia Romana Reformationis Lutheranae patrona et cliens*. There were several wise and thinking persons, at this time, about the Roman pontif, who declared openly, without the least ceremony, their disapprobation of the violent counsels of ECKIUS and the Dominicans; and gave it as their opinion, that it was both prudent and just to wait for the issue of the conferences of MILTITZ with LUTHER, before such forcible measures were employed.

CENT. XVI. moned, on pain of excommunication, to confess and retract his pretended errors within the space of sixty days, and to cast himself upon the clemency and mercy of the pontif.

Luther with-
draws himself
from the com-
munion of the
church of Rome.

XIV. As soon as the account of this rash sentence, pronounced from the papal chair, was brought to LUTHER, he thought it was high time to consult both his present defence and his future security; and the first step he took for this purpose was the renewal of his appeal from the sentence of the Roman pontif, to the more respectable decision of a general council. But as he foresaw that this appeal would be treated with contempt at the court of Rome, and that when the time prescribed for his recantation was elapsed, the thunder of excommunication would be levelled at his devoted head, he judged it prudent to withdraw himself voluntarily from the communion of the church of Rome, before he was obliged to leave it by force; and thus to render this new bull of ejection a blow in the air, an exercise of authority without any object to act upon. At the same time, he was resolved to execute this wise resolution in a public manner, that his voluntary retreat from the communion of a corrupt and superstitious church might be universally known before the lordly pontif had prepared his ghostly thunder. With this view, on the 10th of December, in the year 1520, he had a pile of wood erected without the walls of the city [o], and there, in presence of a prodigious multitude of people of all ranks and orders, he committed to the flames both the *bull* that had been published against him, and the decretals and canons relating to the pope's supreme jurisdiction. By this he declared to the world, that he was no longer a subject of the Roman pontif, and that, of consequence, the sentence of excommunication against him, which was daily expected from Rome, was entirely superfluous and insignificant. For the man, who publicly commits to the flames the *code*, that contains the laws of his sovereign, shews thereby that he has no longer any respect for his government, nor any design to submit to his authority; and the man, who voluntarily withdraws himself from any society, cannot, with any appearance of reason, or common sense, be afterwards forcibly and authoritatively excluded from it. It is not improbable, that LUTHER was directed, in this critical measure, by persons well skilled in the law, who are generally dextrous in furnishing a perplexed client with nice distinctions and plausible evasions. Be that as it may, he separated himself only from the church of Rome, which considers the pope as infallible, and not from the church, considered in a more extensive sense; for he submitted to the decision of the universal church, when that decision should be given in a general council lawfully assembled. When this judicious distinction is considered, it will not appear at all surprizing, that many, even of the Roman catholics, who weighed matters with a certain degree of impartiality and wisdom, and were zealous for the maintenance of the liberties of Germany, justified this bold resolution of LUTHER. In less than a month after this noble and important step had been taken by the

[o] Of Wittemberg.

Saxon

Saxon reformer, a second *bull* was issued out against him on the 6th of January, 1521, by which he was expelled from the communion of the church, for having insulted the majesty, and disowned the supremacy of the Roman pontif [p].

XV. Such iniquitous laws, enacted against the person and doctrine of LUTHER, produced an effect different from what was expected by the imperious pontif. Instead of intimidating this bold reformer, they led him to form the project of founding a church upon principles entirely opposite to those of *Rome*, and to establish, in it, a system of doctrine and ecclesiastical discipline, agreeable to the spirit and precepts of the Gospel of truth. This, indeed, was the only resource LUTHER had left him; for to submit to the orders of a cruel and insolent enemy, would have been the greatest degree of imprudence imaginable, and to embrace, anew, errors that he had rejected with a just indignation, and exposed with the clearest evidence, would have discovered a want of integrity and principle, worthy only of the most abandoned profligate. From this time, therefore, he applied himself to the pursuit of the truth with still more assiduity and fervor than he had formerly done; nor did he only review with attention, and confirm by new arguments, what he had hitherto taught, but went much beyond it, and made vigorous attacks upon the main strong-hold of popery, the power and jurisdiction of the Roman pontif, which he overturned from its very foundation. In this noble undertaking he was seconded by many learned and pious men in various parts of *Europe*, by those of the professors of the academy of *Wittenberg*, who had adopted his principles, and in a more especial manner by the celebrated MELANCTHON. And as the fame of LUTHER's wisdom and MELANCTHON's learning had filled that academy with an incredible number of students, who flocked to it from all parts, this happy circumstance propagated the principles of the Reformation with an amazing rapidity through all the countries of *Europe* [q].

The rise of
the Lutheran
church.

XVI. Not long after the commencement of these divisions, MAXIMILIAN I had departed this life, and his grandson CHARLES V, king of *Spain*, had succeeded him in the empire in the year 1519. LEO X seized this new occasion of venting and executing his vengeance, by putting the new emperor in mind of his character as *advocate and defender of the church*, and demanding the exemplary punishment of LUTHER, who had rebelled against its sacred laws and institutions. On the other hand, FREDERICK the Wise employed his credit with CHARLES to prevent the publication of any unjust edict against this reformer, and to have his cause tried by the canons of the Germanic church and the laws of the empire. This request was so much the more likely to be granted, that CHARLES was under much greater

A diet assembled
at Worms in
1521.

[p] Both these *bulls* are to be found in the *Bullarium Romanum*, and also in the learned PFAFF's *Histor. Theol. Litterar.* tom. ii. p. 42.

[q] There is a particular account of the rapid progress of the reformation in *Germany* given by the learned M. DANIEL GERDES, professor at *Groningen*, in his *Historia renovati Evangelii*, tom. ii.

CENT. XVI. obligations to **FREDERICK**, than to any other of the German princes, as it was chiefly by his zealous and important services that he had been raised to the empire, in opposition to the pretensions of such a formidable rival as **FRANCIS I**, king of *France*. The emperor was sensible of his obligations to the worthy elector, and was entirely disposed to satisfy his demands. That, however, he might do this without displeasing the Roman pontif, he resolved that **LUTHER** should be called before the council, that was to be assembled at *Worms* in the year 1521, and that his cause should be there publicly heard, before any final sentence should be pronounced against him. It may perhaps appear strange, and even inconsistent with the laws of the church, that a cause of a religious nature should be examined and decided in the public diet. But it must be considered, that these diets, in which the archbishops, bishops, and even certain abbots had their places, as well as the princes of the empire, were not only political assemblies, but also provincial councils for *Germany*, to whose jurisdiction, by the ancient canon law, such causes as that of **LUTHER** properly belonged.

The result of this diet, Luther's banishment.

XVII. **LUTHER**, therefore, appeared at *Worms*, secured against the violence of his enemies by a safe-conduct from the emperor, and, on the 17th of April, and the day following, pleaded his cause before that grand assembly with the utmost resolution and presence of mind. The united power of threatnings and entreaties were employed to conquer the firmness of his purpose, to engage him to renounce the propositions he had hitherto maintained, and to bend him to a submission to the Roman pontif. But he refused all this with a noble obstinacy, and declared solemnly, that he would neither abandon his opinions, nor change his conduct, until he was previously convinced, by the word of God, or the dictates of right reason, that his opinions were erroneous, and his conduct unlawful. When therefore neither promises nor threatnings could shake the constancy of this magnanimous reformer, he obtained, indeed, from the emperor the liberty of returning, unmolested, to his home; but after his departure from the diet, he was condemned by the unanimous suffrages both of the emperor and the princes, and was declared an enemy to the holy Roman empire [r].

[(r) This sentence, which was dated the 8th of May 1521, was excessively severe; and **CHARLES V**, whether through sincere zeal or political cunning, shewed himself in this affair an ardent abetter of the papal authority. For in this edict the pope is declared the only true judge of the controversy, in which he was evidently the party concerned; **LUTHER** is declared a *member cut off from the church*, a *schismatic*, a *notorious* and *obstinate heretic*, the severest punishments are denounced against those, who shall receive, entertain, maintain, or countenance, him either by acts of hospitality, by conversation or writing, and all his disciples, adherents, and followers are involved in the same condemnation. This edict was, however, received with the highest disapprobation by all wise and thinking persons, 1st, because **LUTHER** had been condemned without being heard, at *Rome* by the college of cardinals, and afterwards at *Worms*, where, without either examining or refuting his doctrine, he was only despotically ordered to abandon and renounce it; 2^{dly}, because **CHARLES V**, as emperor, had not a right to give an authoritative sentence against the doctrine of **LUTHER**, nor to take for granted the *infallibility* of the Roman pontif, before these matters were discussed and decided by a general council; and 3^{dly}, because a considerable number of the German princes, who were immediately interested in this affair, such as the electors of *Cologne*, *Saxony*, and the *Palatinate*, and other sovereign princes, had neither been present at the diet, nor examined and approved the edict; and that therefore, at best, it could only have force in the territories belonging

FREDERICK,

FREDERICK, who saw the storm rising against LUTHER, used the best precaution to secure him from its violence. For this purpose he sent three or four persons, in whom he could confide, to meet him on his return from the diet, in order to conduct him to a place of safety. These emissaries, disguised by masks, executed their commission with the utmost secrecy and success. Meeting with LUTHER, near *Eysenac*, they seized him, and carried him into the castle of *Wartenberg*, nor, as some have imagined upon probable grounds, was this done without the knowledge of his Imperial majesty. In this retreat, which he called his *Patmos*, the Saxon reformer lay concealed during the space of ten months, and employed this involuntary leisure in compositions that were afterwards useful to the world [5].

XVIII. The active spirit of LUTHER could not, however, long bear this confinement; he therefore left his *Patmos* in the month of March, of

The conduct of Luther after his leaving the castle of *Wartenberg*.

to the house of *Austria*, and to such of the princes as had given their consent to its publication. But after all, the edict of *Worms* produced almost no effect, not only for the reasons now mentioned, but also because CHARLES V, whose presence, authority, and zeal were necessary to render it respectable, was involved in other affairs of a civil nature, which he had more at heart. Obligated to pass successively into *Flanders*, *England*, and *Spain*, to quell the seditions of his subjects, and to form new alliances against his great enemy and rival FRANCIS I, he lost sight of the edict of *Worms*, while all who had any regard to the liberties of the empire and the rights of the Germanic church treated this edict with the highest indignation, or the utmost contempt.]

[5] This precaution of the humane and excellent elector, being put in execution the 3^d of May, five days before the solemn publication of the edict of *Worms*, the pope missed his blow; and the adversaries of LUTHER became doubly odious to the people in *Germany*, who, unacquainted with the scheme of FREDERICK, and, not knowing what was become of their favorite reformer, imagined he was imprisoned or perhaps destroyed by the emissaries of *Rome*. In the mean time, LUTHER lived in peace and quiet in the castle of *Wartenberg*, where he translated a great part of the *New Testament* into the German language, and wrote frequent letters to his trusty friends and intimates to comfort them under his absence. Nor was his confinement here inconsistent with amusement and relaxation; for he enjoyed frequently the pleasure of hunting in company with his keepers, passing for a country gentleman, under the name of *Yonker George*.]

[If we cast an eye upon the conduct of LUTHER, in this first scene of his trials, we shall find a true spirit of rational zeal, generous probity, and Christian fortitude animating this reformer. In his behaviour, before and at the diet of *Worms*, we observe these qualities shine with a peculiar lustre, and, tempered, notwithstanding LUTHER's warm complexion, with an unexpected degree of moderation and decent respect both for his civil and ecclesiastical superiors. When some of his friends, informed of the violent designs of the Roman court, and alarmed by the bull that had been published against him by the rash pontif, advised him not to expose his person at the diet of *Worms*, notwithstanding the imperial safe-conduct, (which, in a similar case, had not been sufficient to protect JOHN HUS and JEROM of *Prague* from the perfidy and cruelty of their enemies) he answered with his usual intrepidity, that were he obliged to encounter at *Worms* as many devils, as there were tiles upon the houses of that city, this would not deter him from his fixed purpose of appearing there; that, fear, in his case, could be only a suggestion of Satan, who apprehended the approaching ruin of his kingdom, and, who was willing to avoid a public defeat before such a grand assembly, as the diet of *Worms*. The fire and obstinacy that appeared in this answer seemed to prognosticate much warmth and vehemence in LUTHER's conduct at the assembly before which he was going to appear. But it was quite otherwise. He exposed with decency and dignity the superstitious doctrines and practices of the church of *Rome*, and the grievances that arose from the overgrown power of its pontif, and the abuse that was made of it. He acknowledged the writings with which he was charged, and offered, both with moderation and humility, to defend their contents. He desired the pope's legates and their adherents to hear him, to inform him, to reason with him, and solemnly offered, in presence of the assembled princes and bishops, to renounce his doctrines, if they were shewn to be erroneous. But to all these expostulations he received no other answer, than the despotic dictates of mere authority, attended with injurious and provoking language.]

the

CENT. XVI. the year 1522, without the consent, or even the knowledge, of his patron and protector, FREDERICK, and repaired to *Wittemberg*. One of the principal motives that engaged him to take this bold step, was the information he had received of the inconsiderate conduct of CARLOSTADT, and some other friends of the Reformation, who had already excited tumults in *Saxony*, and were acting in a manner equally prejudicial to the tranquillity of the state and the true interests of the church. CARLOSTADT, professor at *Wittemberg*, was a man of considerable learning, who had pierced the vail, with which papal artifice and superstition had covered the truth, and, at the instigation of ECKIUS, had been excluded with LUTHER from the communion of the church. His zeal, however, was intemperate; his plans laid with temerity, and executed without moderation. During LUTHER's absence, he threw down and broke the images of the saints that were placed in the churches, and instead of restraining the vehemence of a fanatical multitude, who had already begun in some places to abuse the precious liberty that was dawning upon them, he encouraged their ill-timed violence, and led them on to sedition and mutiny. LUTHER opposed the impetuosity of this imprudent reformer with the utmost fortitude and dignity, and wisely exhorted him and his adherents first to eradicate error from the minds of the people, before they made war upon its external ensigns in the churches and public places, since, the former being once removed, the latter must fall of course [t], and since the destruction of the latter alone could be attended with no lasting fruits. To these prudent admonitions this excellent reformer added the influence of example, by applying himself, with redoubled industry and zeal, to his German translation of the Holy Scriptures, which he carried on with expedition and success [u], with the assistance of some learned and pious men, whom he consulted in this great and important undertaking. The event abundantly shewed the wisdom of LUTHER's advice. For the different parts of this

[t] Dr. MOSHEIM's account of this matter is perhaps more advantageous to LUTHER, than the rigorous demands of historical impartiality will admit of; the defects at least of the great reformer are here shaded with art. It is evident from several passages in the writings of LUTHER, that he was by no means averse to the use of images, but that, on the contrary, he looked upon them, as adapted to excite and animate the devotion of the people. But, perhaps, the true reason of LUTHER's displeasure at the proceedings of CARLOSTADT, was, that he could not bear to see another crowned with the glory of executing a plan, which he had laid, and that he was ambitious of appearing the principal, if not the only conductor of this great work. This is not a mere conjecture. LUTHER himself has not taken the least pains to conceal this instance of his ambition, and it appears evidently in several of his letters. On the other hand it must be owned, that CARLOSTADT was rash, violent, and prone to enthusiasm, as appears by the connexions he formed afterwards with the fanatical anabaptists, headed by MUNZER. His contests with LUTHER about the eucharist, in which he manifestly maintained the truth, shall be mentioned in their proper place.]

[u] Of this *German translation of the Bible*, which contributed more than all other causes, taken together, to strengthen the foundations of the Lutheran church, we have an interesting history composed by JO. FRID. MAYER, and published in 4^{to} at *Hamburg*, in the year 1701. A more ample one, however, was expected from the labours of the learned J. MELCHIOR KRAFT, but his death has disappointed our hopes. See JO. ALB. FABRICII *Centifolium Lutheran.* par. I. p. 147. & par. II. p. 617.

translation,

translation, being successively and gradually spread abroad among the people, produced sudden, and almost incredible effects, and extirpated, root and branch, the erroneous principles and superstitious doctrines of the church of *Rome* from the minds of a prodigious number of persons.

XIX. While these things were transacting, LEO X departed this life, and was succeeded in the pontificate by ADRIAN VI, a native of *Utrecht*. This pope, who had formerly been preceptor to CHARLES V, and who owed his new dignity to the good offices of that prince, was a man of probity and candor, who acknowledged ingenuously that the church laboured under the most fatal disorders, and declared his willingness to apply the remedies that should be most adapted to heal them [w]. He began his pontificate by sending a legate to the diet, which was assembled at *Nuremberg* in 1522. FRANCIS CHEREGATO, the person who was intrusted with this commission, had positive orders to demand the speedy and vigorous execution of the sentence that had been pronounced against LUTHER and his followers at the diet of *Worms*, but, at the same time, he was authorized to declare that the pontif was ready to remove the abuses and grievances that had armed such a formidable enemy against the see of *Rome*. The princes of the empire encouraged by this declaration on the one hand, and by the absence of the emperor, who, at this time, resided in *Spain*, on the other, seized this opportunity of proposing the summoning a general council in *Germany*, in order to deliberate upon the proper methods of bringing about an universal reformation of the church. They exhibited, at the same time, an hundred articles, containing the heaviest complaints of the injurious treatment the Germans had hitherto received from the court of *Rome*, and, by a public law, prohibited all innovation in religious matters, until a general council should decide what was to be done in an affair of such high moment and importance [x]. As long as the German princes were unacquainted with, or inattentive to the measures that were taken in *Saxony* for founding a new church in direct opposition to that of *Rome*, they were zealously unanimous in their endeavours to set bounds to the papal authority and jurisdiction, which they all looked upon as overgrown and enormous, nor were they at all offended at LUTHER's contest with the Roman pontif, which they considered as a dispute of a private and personal nature.

XX. The good pope ADRIAN did not long enjoy the pleasure of sitting at the head of the church. He died in the year 1523, and was succeeded by CLEMENT VII, a man of a reserved character, and prone to artifice [y]. This pontif sent to the imperial diet at *Nuremberg*, in the year 1524, a cardinal-legate, named CAMPEGIUS, whose orders, with respect to the affairs of LUTHER, breathed nothing but severity and violence, and who inveighed

Leo X succeeded by Adrian VI in the year 1522, Diet of *Nuremberg*.

Clement VII elected pope in the year 1524.

[w] See CASPAR. BURMANNI *Adrianus VI, sive Analecta Historica de Adriano VI Papa Romano*, published at *Utrecht* in 4^{to} in the year 1727.

[x] See JAC. FRID. GEORGII *Gravamina Germanorum adversus Sedem Romanam*, lib. ii. p. 327.

[y] See JAC. ZIEGLERI *Historia Clementis VII*, in JO. GEORGII SCHELHORNII *Amicitiae Histor. Eccles.* tom. ii. p. 210.

CENT. XVI.

against the lenity of the German princes in delaying the execution of the decree of *Worms*, while he carefully avoided the smallest mention of the promise ADRIAN had made to reform the corruptions of a superstitious church. The emperor seconded the demands of CAMPEGIUS by the orders he sent to his minister to insist upon the execution of the sentence which had been pronounced against LUTHER and his adherents at the diet of *Worms*. The princes of the empire tired out by these importunities and remonstrances, changed in appearance the law they had passed, but confirmed it in reality. For while they promise to observe, as far as was possible, the edict of *Worms*, they, at the same time, renewed their demands of a general council, and left all other matters in dispute to be examined and decided at the diet that was soon to be assembled at *Spire*. The pope's legate, on the other hand, perceiving by these proceedings, that the German princes in general were no enemies to the Reformation, retired to *Ratisbon* with the bishops and those of the princes that adhered to the cause of *Rome*, and there drew from them a new declaration, by which they engaged themselves to execute rigorously the edict of *Worms* in their respective dominions.

Carlostadt and
Zuingle.

XXI. While the efforts of LUTHER towards the reformation of the church were daily crowned with growing success, and almost all the nations seemed disposed to open their eyes upon the light, two unhappy occurrences, one of a foreign, and the other of a domestic nature, contributed greatly to retard the progress of this salutary and glorious work. The domestic, or internal incident, was a controversy concerning the *manner* in which the body and blood of Christ were present in the eucharist, that arose among those whom the Roman pontif had publicly excluded from the communion of the church, and unhappily produced among the friends of the good cause the most deplorable animosities and divisions. LUTHER and his followers, though they had rejected the monstrous doctrine of the church of *Rome* with respect to the *transubstantiation*, or change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of CHRIST, were nevertheless of opinion, that the partakers of the Lord's supper received, along with the bread and wine, the real body and blood of Christ. This, in their judgment, was a mystery, which they did not pretend to explain [z]. CARLOSTADT, who was LUTHER's colleague, understood the matter quite otherwise, and his doctrine, which was afterwards illustrated and confirmed by ZUINGLE with much more ingenuity than he had proposed it, amounted to this: "That the body and blood of Christ were not *really* present in the eucharist; and that the bread and wine were no more than external *signs*, or *symbols*, designed to excite in the minds of Christians the remembrance of the sufferings and death of the divine Saviour, and of the benefits which

[(z) LUTHER was not so modest as Dr. MOSHEIM here represents him. He pretended to explain his doctrine of the *real presence*, absurd and contradictory as it was, and uttered much senseless jargon on this subject. As in a red-hot iron, *said he*, two distinct substances, *viz.* iron and fire are united, so is the body of Christ joined with the bread in the eucharist. I mention this miserable comparison to shew into what absurdities the towering pride of system will often betray men of deep sense and true genius.]

"arise from it [a]." This opinion was embraced by all the friends of the Reformation in *Switzerland* and by a considerable number of its votaries in *Germany*. On the other hand, LUTHER maintained his doctrine, in relation to this point, with the utmost obstinacy; and hence arose, in the year 1524, a tedious and vehement controversy, which, notwithstanding the zealous endeavours that were used to reconcile the contending parties, terminated, at length, in a fatal division between those who had embarked together in the sacred cause of religion and liberty.

XXII. To these intestine divisions were added the horrors of a civil war, which was the fatal effect of oppression on the one hand, and of enthusiasm on the other; and, by its unhappy consequences, was prejudicial to the cause and progress of the reformation. In the year 1525, a prodigious multitude of seditious fanatics arose like a whirlwind, all of a sudden in different parts of *Germany*, took arms, united their forces, waged war against the laws, the magistrates, and the empire in general, layed waste the country with fire and sword, and exhibited daily the most horrid spectacles of unrelenting barbarity. The greatest part of this furious and formidable mob was composed of peasants and vassals, who groaned under heavy burthens, and declared they were no longer able to bear the despotic severity of their chiefs; and hence this sedition was called the *Rustic war*; or the war of the Peasants. [b]. But it is also certain, that this motley croud was intermixed with numbers, who joined in this sedition from different motives, some impelled by the suggestions of enthusiasm, and others by the profligate and odious view of rapine and plunder, of mending fortunes ruined by extravagant and dissolute living. At the first breaking out of this war, it seemed to have been kindled only by civil and political views, and agreeable to this is the general tenor of the *Declarations* and *Manifestos* that were published by these rioters. The claims they made in these papers related to nothing farther than the diminution of the tasks imposed upon the Peasants, and to their obtaining a greater measure of liberty than they had hitherto enjoyed. Religion seemed to be out of the question; at least, it was not the object of deliberation or debate. But no sooner had the enthusiast MUNZER [c] put himself at the head of this outrageous rabble, than the face of things changed entirely, and by the instigation of this man, who had deceived numbers before this time by his pretended visions and inspirations, the civil commotions in *Saxony* and

The war of the Peasants.

[a] See VAL. ERN. LOSCHER *Historia motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformatos*, par. I. lib. i. cap. ii. p. 55.—See also, on the other side of the question, SCULTET'S *Annales Evangelii*, published by VON DER HART, in his *Historia Litter. Reformat.* p. 74.—RUD. HOSPITIANUS, and other reformed writers, who have treated of the origin and progress of this dispute.

[b] These kinds of wars, or commotions, arising from the impatience of the Peasants, under the heavy burthens that were laid on them, were very common long before the time of LUTHER. Hence the author of the *Danish Chronicle* (published by the learned LUDEWIG, in the ninth volume of his *Reliq. Mstorum*, p. 59.) calls these insurrections a *common evil*. This will not appear surprising to such as consider, that in most places the condition of the Peasants was much more intolerable and grievous before the reformation, than it is in our times; and that the tyranny and cruelty of the nobility, before that happy period, were excessive and insupportable.

[c] Or MUNSTER, as some call him.

CENT. XVI. *Thuringia* were soon directed towards a new object, and were turned into a religious war. The sentiments, however, of this seditious and dissolute multitude were greatly divided, and their demands were very different. One part of them pleaded for an exemption from all laws, a licentious immunity from every sort of government: another, less outrageous and extravagant, confined their demands to a diminution of the taxes they were forced to pay, and of the burthens under which they groaned [*d*]; another, insisted upon a new form of religious doctrine, government, and worship, upon the establishment of a pure and unspotted church, and, to add weight to this demand, pretended, that it was suggested by the Holy Ghost, with which they were divinely and miraculously inspired; while a very considerable part of this furious rabble were without any distinct view or any fixed purpose at all, but, infected with the contagious spirit of sedition, and exasperated by the severity of their magistrates and rulers, went on headlong without reflexion or foresight into every act of violence and cruelty which rebellion and enthusiasm could suggest. So that if it cannot be denied that many of these rioters had perversely misunderstood the doctrine of LUTHER concerning Christian liberty, and took occasion from thence of committing the disorders that rendered them so justly odious, yet, on the other hand, it would be a most absurd instance of partiality and injustice to charge that doctrine with the blame of those extravagant outrages that arose only from the manifest abuse of it. LUTHER, himself, has indeed sufficiently defended both his principles and his cause against any such imputations by the books he wrote against this turbulent sect, and the advice he addressed to the princes of the empire to take arms against them. And, accordingly, in the year 1525, this odious faction was defeated, and destroyed in a pitched battle fought at *Mulhausen*, and MÜNZER, their ringleader, taken, and put to death [*e*].

Frederick the
Wise dies, and is
succeeded by
John, 1525---
1527.

XXIII. While this fanatical insurrection raged in *Germany*, FREDERICK, *the Wise*, elector of *Saxony*, departed this life. This excellent prince, whose character was distinguished by an uncommon degree of prudence and moderation, had, during his life, been a sort of a mediator between the Roman pontif and the reformer of *Wittenberg*, and had always entertained the pleasing hope of restoring peace in the church, and of so reconciling the contending parties as to prevent a separation either in point of ecclesiastical jurisdiction or religious communion. Hence it was, that while, on the one hand, he made no opposition to LUTHER's design of reforming a corrupt and superstitious church, but rather encouraged him in the execution of this pious purpose; yet, on the other, it is remarkable, that he was at no pains to introduce any change into the churches that were established in his own dominions, nor to subject them to his jurisdiction. The elector

[*d*] These burthens were the duties of vassalage or feudal services, which, in many respects, were truly grievous.

[*e*] PETRI GNODALII *Historia de Seditione repentina Vulgi, præcipue Rusticorum*, A. 1525, tempore æverno per universam fere Germaniam exorta, Basil. 1570, in 8^{vo}.—See also B. TENZELII *Histor. Reform.* tom. ii. p. 331.

JOHN, his brother and successor, acted in a quite different manner. Con-
vinced of the truth of LUTHER's doctrine, and persuaded that it must lose
ground and be soon suppressed, if the despotic authority of the Roman
pontif remained undisputed and entire, he, without hesitation or delay,
assumed to himself that supremacy in ecclesiastical matters that is the natural
right of every lawful sovereign, and founded and established a church in
his dominions, totally different from the church of *Rome* in doctrine, dis-
cipline, and government. To bring this new and happy establishment to
as great a degree of perfection as was possible, this resolute and active prince
ordered a body of laws, relating to the form of ecclesiastical government,
the method of public worship, the rank, offices, and revenues of the priest-
hood, and other matters of that nature, to be drawn up by LUTHER and
MELANCTHON, and promulgated by heralds throughout his dominions in
the year 1527. He also took care that the churches should every where be
supplied with pious and learned doctors, and that such of the clergy as
dishonoured religion by their bad morals, or were incapable of promoting
its influence by their want of talents, should be removed from the sacred
functions. The illustrious example of this elector was followed by all the
princes and states of *Germany* who renounced the papal supremacy and
jurisdiction, and a like form of worship, discipline, and government was thus
introduced into all the churches, which dissented from that of *Rome*.
Thus may the elector JOHN be considered as the second parent and founder
of the Lutheran church, which he alone rendered a complete and inde-
pendent body, distinct from the superstitious church of *Rome*, and fenced
about with salutary laws and a wise and well-balanced constitution of
government. But as the best blessings may, through the influence of
human corruption, become the innocent occasions of great inconveniences,
such particularly was the fate of those wise and vigorous measures which
this elector took for the reformation of the church; for from that time, the
religious differences between the German princes, which had been hitherto
kept within the bounds of moderation, broke out into a violent and lasting
flame. The prudence, or rather timorousness, of FREDERICK the *Wise*,
who avoided every resolute measure that might be adapted to kindle the
fire of discord, had preserved a sort of an external union and concord among
these princes, notwithstanding their difference in opinion. But as soon as
his successor, by the open and undisguised steps he took, made it glaringly
evident, that he designed to withdraw the churches in his dominions from
the jurisdiction of *Rome*, and to reform the doctrine, discipline, and worship
that had been hitherto established, then indeed the scene changed. The
union, which was more specious than solid, and which was far from being
well cemented, was dissolved of a sudden, the spirits heated and divided, and
an open rupture formed between the German princes, of whom one party
embraced the Reformation, and the other adhered to the superstitions of
their fore-fathers.

XXIV. Things being reduced to this violent and troubled state, the
patrons of popery gave intimations, that were far from being ambiguous,
of

The diet of
Spire in 1526.

CENT. XVI. of their intention to make war upon the Lutheran party, and to suppress by force a doctrine which they were incapable of overturning by argument; and this design would certainly have been put in execution, had not the troubles of *Europe* disconcerted their measures. The Lutherans, on the other hand, informed of these hostile intentions, began also to deliberate upon the most effectual methods of defending themselves against superstition armed with violence, and formed the plan of a confederacy that might answer this prudent purpose. In the mean time the diet assembled at *Spire*, in the year 1526, at which **Ferdinand**, the emperor's brother, presided, ended in a manner more favourable to the friends of the Reformation, than they could naturally expect. The emperor's ambassadors at this diet were ordered to use their most earnest endeavours for the suppression of all farther disputes concerning religion, and to insist upon the rigorous execution of the sentence that had been pronounced at *Worms* against **Luther** and his followers. The greatest part of the German princes opposed this motion with the utmost resolution, declaring, that they could not execute that sentence, nor come to any determination with respect to the doctrines by which it had been occasioned, before the whole matter was submitted to the cognizance of a general council lawfully assembled; alledging farther, that the decision of controversies of this nature belonged properly to such a council, and to it alone. This opinion, after long and warm debates, was adopted by a great majority, and, at length, consented to by the whole assembly; for it was unanimously agreed to present a solemn address to the emperor, beseeching him to assemble, without delay, a free and a general council; and it was also agreed, that, in the mean time, the princes and states of the empire should, in their respective dominions, be at liberty to manage ecclesiastical matters in the manner they should think the most expedient; yet so, as to be able to give to God and to the emperor an account of their administration, when it should be demanded of them.

The progress of
the reformation
after the diet at
Spire, in 1527.

XXV. Nothing could be more favourable to those who had the cause of pure and genuine Christianity at heart, than a resolution of this nature. For the emperor was, at this time, so entirely taken up in regulating the troubled state of his dominions in *France*, *Spain*, and *Italy*, which exhibited, from day to day, new scenes of perplexity; that, for some years, it was not in his power to turn his attention to the affairs of *Germany* in general, and still less to the state of religion in particular, which to a political prince, like **Charles**, was beset with difficulties of the most critical and dangerous nature. Besides, had the emperor really been possessed of leisure to form, or of power to execute, a plan that might terminate, in favour of the Roman pontif, the religious disputes which reigned in *Germany*, it is evident that the inclination was wanting, and that **Clement VII**, who now sat in the papal chair, had nothing to expect from the good offices of **Charles V**. For this pontif, after the defeat of **Francis I**, at the battle of *Pavia*, filled with uneasy apprehensions of the growing power of the emperor in *Italy*, entered into a confederacy with the French and the Venetians against that

that prince. And this measure inflamed the resentment and indignation of CHARLES to such a degree, that he abolished the papal authority in his Spanish dominions, made war upon the pope in *Italy*, laid siege to *Rome* in the year 1527, blocked up CLEMENT in the castle of *St. Angelo*, and exposed him to the most severe and contumelious treatment. These critical events, together with the liberty granted by the diet of *Spire*, were prudently and industriously improved, by the friends of the reformation, to the advantage of their cause, and to the augmentation of their number. Several princes whom the fear of persecution and punishment had hitherto prevented from lending a hand to the good work, being delivered now from their restraint, renounced publicly the superstition of *Rome*; and introduced among their subjects the same forms of religious worship, and the same system of doctrine, that had been received in *Saxony*. Others, though placed in such circumstances as discouraged them from acting in an open manner against the interests of the Roman pontif, were, however, far from discovering the smallest opposition to those who withdrew the people from his despotic yoke; nor did they molest the private assemblies of those who had separated themselves from the church of *Rome*. And in general, all the Germans, who, before these resolutions of the diet of *Spire*, had rejected the papal discipline and doctrine, were now, in consequence of the liberty they enjoyed by these resolutions, wholly employed in bringing their schemes and plans to a certain degree of consistence, and in adding vigour and firmness to the glorious cause in which they were engaged. In the mean time, LUTHER and his fellow-labourers, particularly those who were with him at *Wittenberg*, by their writings, their instructions, their admonitions and counsels, inspired the timorous with fortitude, dispelled the doubts of the ignorant, fixed the principles and resolution of the floating and inconstant, and animated all the friends of genuine Christianity with a spirit suitable to the grandeur of their undertaking.

XXVI. But the tranquillity and liberty they enjoyed, in consequence of the resolutions taken in the first diet of *Spire*, were not of a long duration. They were interrupted by a new diet assembled in the year 1529, in the same place by the emperor, after he had appeased the commotions and troubles which had employed his attention in several parts of *Europe*, and concluded a treaty of peace with CLEMENT VII. This prince, having now got rid of the burthen that had, for some time, overwhelmed him, had leisure to direct the affairs of the church; and this the reformers soon felt by a disagreeable experience. For the power which had been granted by the former diet to every prince, of managing ecclesiastical matters as they thought proper, until the meeting of a general council, was now revoked by a majority of votes; and not only so, but every change declared unlawful that should be introduced into the doctrine, discipline, or worship of the established religion before the determination of the approaching council was known [*f*]. This decree was justly considered as iniquitous.

Another diet held at *Spire* in the year 1529—Origin of the denomination of protestants.

[(*f*) The resolution of the first diet of *Spire*, which had been taken *unanimously*, is revoked in the second, and another substituted in its place by a *plurality of voices*, which, as several of the

and

CENT. XVI. and intolerable by the elector of *Saxony*, the landgrave of *Hesse*, and the other members of the diet, who were persuaded of the necessity of a reformation in the church. Nor was any of them so simple or so little acquainted with the politics of *Rome*, as to look upon the promises of assembling speedily a general council, in any other light, than as an artifice to quiet the minds of the people; since it was easy to perceive, that a lawful council free from the despotic influence of *Rome*, was the very last thing that a pope would grant in such a critical situation of affairs. Therefore when the princes and members now mentioned, found that all their arguments and remonstrances against this unjust decree made no impression upon *Ferdinand* [g], nor upon the abettors of the ancient superstitions (whom the pope's legate animated by his presence and exhortations) they entered a solemn *protest* against this decree on the 19th of April, and appealed to the emperor and to a future council [b]. Hence arose the denomination of *Protestants*, which from this period has been given to those who renounce the superstitious communion of the church of *Rome*.

Leagues formed
between the pro-
testants.

XXVII. The dissenting princes, who were the protectors and heads of the reformed churches, had no sooner entered their *protest*, than they sent proper persons to the emperor, who was then upon his passage from *Spain* to *Italy*, to acquaint him with their proceedings in this matter. The ministers, employed in this commission, executed the orders they had received with the greatest resolution and presence of mind, and behaved with the spirit and firmness of the princes, whose sentiments and conduct they were sent to justify and explain. The emperor, whose pride was wounded by this fortitude in persons that dared to oppose his designs, ordered these ambassadors to be apprehended and put under arrest during several days. The news of this violent step was soon brought to the protestant princes, and made them conclude that their personal safety, and the success of their cause, depended entirely upon their courage and concord, the one animated, and the other cemented by a solemn confederacy. They, therefore, held several meetings at *Rot*, *Nuremberg*, *Smalcald*, and other places, in order to deliberate upon the means of forming such a powerful league as might enable them to repel the violence of their enemies [i]. But so different were their opinions and views of things, that they could come to no satisfactory conclusion.

princes, then present, observed, could not give to any decree the force of a law throughout the empire.]

[(g) The emperor was at *Barcelona*, while this diet was held at *Spire*; so that his brother *Ferdinand* was president in his place.]

[(b) The princes of the empire, who entered this protest, and are consequently to be considered as the first protestant princes, were *John*, elector of *Saxony*, *George*, elector of *Brandenburg*, for *Franconia*, *Ernest* and *Francis*, dukes of *Lauenburg*, the landgrave of *Hesse*, and the prince of *Anhalt*. These princes were seconded by thirteen imperial towns, viz. *Strasburg*, *Ulm*, *Nuremberg*, *Constance*, *Rottingen*, *Windseim*, *Memmingen*, *Nortlingen*, *Lindaw*, *Kempten*, *Heilbron*, *Wissenburg*, and *St. Gall*.]

[i] See the history of the confession of *Augsburg* wrote in German by the learned *CHRIST. AUG. SALIG.* tom. i. book II. ch. i. p. 128. and more especially another German work of *Dr. JOACHIM MULLER*, entituled, *Historie von der Evangelischen Stande Protestation gegen den Speyerschen Reichsabscheid von 1529, Appellation, &c.* published at *Jena* in 4^{to} in the year 1703.

XXVIII. Among

XXVIII. Among the incidents that promoted animosity and discord between the friends of the reformation, and prevented that union that was so much to be desired between persons embarked in the same good cause, the principal one was the dispute that had arisen between the divines of Saxony and Switzerland concerning the manner of Christ's presence in the eucharist. To terminate this controversy, PHILIP, landgrave of Hesse, invited, in the year 1529, to a conference at Marburg, LUTHER and ZUINGLE, together with some of the more eminent doctors who adhered to the respective parties of these contending chiefs. This expedient, which was designed by that truly *Magnanimous* prince, not so much to end the matter by keen debate, as to accommodate differences by the reconciling spirit of charity and prudence, was not attended with the salutary fruits that were expected from it. The divines that were assembled for this pacific purpose disputed, during four days, in presence of the landgrave. The principal champions in these debates were LUTHER, who attacked OECOLAMPADIUS, and MELANCTHON, who disputed against ZUINGLE, and the controversy turned upon several points of theology, in relation to which the Swiss doctors were supposed to entertain erroneous sentiments. For ZUINGLE was accused of heresy, not only on account of his rational explication of the nature and design of the Lord's supper, but also in consequence of the false notions he was supposed to have adopted of the divinity of Christ, the efficacy of the divine word, original sin, and some other parts of the Christian doctrine. This illustrious reformer cleared himself, however, from the greatest part of these accusations with the most triumphant evidence, and in such a manner as appeared entirely satisfactory, even to LUTHER himself. Their dissension concerning the manner of CHRIST's presence in the eucharist still remained; nor could either of the contending parties be persuaded to abandon, or even to modify, their opinion of that matter [k]. The only advantage, therefore, that resulted from this conference, was, that the jarring doctors formed a sort of truce, by agreeing to a mutual toleration of their respective sentiments, and leaving to the disposal of providence and the effects of time, which sometimes cools the rage of party, the cure of their divisions.

CENT. XVI.

The conference
at Marburg, in
the year 1529.

XXIX. The ministers of the churches, which had embraced the sentiments of LUTHER, were preparing a new embassy to the emperor, when an account was received of a design formed by that prince to come into Germany, with a view to terminate, in the approaching diet at Augsburg, the religious disputes that had produced such animosities and divisions in the empire. CHARLES, though long absent from Germany, and engaged in affairs that left him little leisure for theological disquisitions, was nevertheless attentive to these disputes, and foresaw their consequences. He

The diet of
Augsburg.

[k] VAL. ERN. LOESCHER *Historia motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformatos*, tom. i. lib. i. cap. vi. p. 143. — HENR. BULLINGER *Historia Colloquii Marpurgensis*, in JO. CONR. FUSSLIN's compilation, entitled, *Beyträgen zur Schweizer Reformat. Geschichte*, tom. iii. p. 156. See also the *Preface*, p. 80. — ABR. SCULTETI *Annal. Reformat. ad A. 1529*. — RUDOLPH. HOSPINIANI *Histor. Sacramentar.* par. II. p. 72, &c.

CENT. XVI. had also, to his own deliberate reflexions upon these disputes, added the counsels of men of wisdom, sagacity, and experience, and was thus, at certain seasons, rendered more cool in his proceedings and more moderate and impartial in his opinion both of the contending parties and of the merits of the cause. He therefore, in an interview with the pope at *Bologna*, insisted, in the most serious and urgent manner, upon the necessity of assembling a general council. His remonstrances and expostulations could not, however, move CLEMENT VII, who maintained with zeal the papal prerogatives, reproached the emperor with an ill judged clemency, and alledged that it was the duty of that prince to support the church, and to execute speedy vengeance upon the obstinate *heretical* faction, who dared to call in question the authority of *Rome* and its pontif. The emperor was as little affected by this haughty discourse, as the pope had been by his wise remonstrances, and looked upon it as a most iniquitous thing, a measure also in direct opposition to the laws of the empire, to condemn unheard, and to destroy without any evidence of their demerit, a set of men, who had always approved themselves good citizens, and had deserved well of their country in several respects. Hitherto, indeed, it was not easy for the emperor to form a clear idea of the matters in debate, since there was no regular system, as yet composed, of the doctrines embraced by LUTHER and his followers, by which their real opinions, and the true causes of their opposition to the Roman pontif, might be known with certainty. As, therefore, it was impossible, without some declaration of this nature, to examine with accuracy, or decide with equity, a matter of such high importance as that which gave rise to the divisions between the votaries of *Rome* and the friends of the reformation, the elector of *Saxony* ordered LUTHER, and other eminent divines, to commit to writing the chief articles of their religious system, and the principal points in which they differed from the church of *Rome*. LUTHER, in compliance with this order, delivered to the elector, at *Torgaw*, the seventeen articles, which had been drawn up and agreed on in the conference at *Sultzbach* in the year 1529; and hence they were called the *articles of Torgaw* [1]. Though these articles were deemed by LUTHER a sufficient declaration of the sentiments of the reformers, yet it was judged proper to enlarge them; and, by a judicious detail, to give perspicuity to their arguments, and thereby strength to their cause. It was this consideration that engaged the protestant princes, assembled at *Coburg* and *Augsburg*, to employ MELANCTHON in extending these *Articles*, in which important work he shewed a due regard to the counsels of LUTHER, and expressed his sentiments and doctrine with the greatest elegance and perspicuity. And thus came forth to public view the famous *confession of Augsburg*, which did such honour to the acute judgment and the eloquent pen of MELANCTHON.

[1] See CHR. AUG. HEUMANNI *Diff. de lenitate Augustanæ Confess. in Sylloge Dissert. Theologicar.* tom. i. p. 14. — JO. JOACH. MÜLLER *Historia Protestationis*; and the other writers, who have treated either of the reformation in general, or of the confession of *Augsburg* in particular.

XXX. During these transactions in *Germany* the dawn of truth arose upon other nations. The light of the blessed reformation spread itself far and wide; and almost all the European states welcomed its salutary beams and exulted in the prospect of an approaching deliverance from the yoke of superstition and spiritual despotism. Some of the most considerable provinces of *Europe* had already broke their chains, and openly withdrawn themselves from the discipline of *Rome* and the jurisdiction of its pontif. And thus it appears that CLEMENT VII was not impelled by a false alarm to demand of the emperor the speedy extirpation of the reformers, since he had the justest reasons to apprehend the destruction of his ghostly empire. The reformed religion was propagated in *Sweden*, soon after LUTHER's rupture with *Rome*, by one of his disciples whose name was OLAUS PETRI, and who was the first herald of religious liberty in that kingdom. The zealous efforts of this missionary were powerfully seconded by that valiant and public-spirited prince, GUSTAVUS VASA ERIESON, whom the Swedes had raised to the throne in the place of CHRISTIERN, king of *Denmark*, whose horrid barbarity lost him the scepter, that he had perfidiously usurped. This generous and patriot hero had been in exile and in prison, while the brutish usurper, now mentioned, was involving his country in desolation and misery; but having escaped from his confinement, and taken refuge at *Lubec*, he was there instructed in the principles of the reformation, and looked upon the doctrine of LUTHER not only as agreeable to the genius and spirit of the Gospel, but also as favourable to the temporal state and political constitution of the Swedish dominions. The prudence, however, of this excellent prince was equal to his zeal, and accompanied it always. And as the religious opinions of the Swedes were in a fluctuating state, and their minds divided between their ancient superstitions recommended by custom, and the doctrine of LUTHER which attracted their assent by the power of conviction and truth, GUSTAVUS wisely avoided all vehemence and precipitation in spreading the new doctrine, and proceeded in this important undertaking with circumspection, and by degrees, in a manner suitable to the principles of the reformation, which are diametrically opposite to compulsion and violence [m]. Accordingly, the first object of his attention was the instruction of his people in the sacred doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, for which purpose he invited into his dominions several learned Germans, and spread abroad through the kingdom the Swedish translation of the Bible that had been made by OLAUS PETRI [n]. Some time after this, in the year 1526, he appointed

CENT. XVI.
The progress of
the reformation
in *Sweden*, about
the year 1530.

[(m) This incomparable model of princes gave many proofs of his wisdom and moderation. Once, while he was absent from *Stockholm*, a great number of German anabaptists, probably the riotous disciples of *Munzer*, arrived in that city, carried their fanaticism to the highest extremities, pulled down with fury the images and other ornaments of the churches, while the *Lutherans* dissembled their sentiments of this riot in expectation that the storm would turn to their advantage. But GUSTAVUS no sooner returned to *Stockholm*, than he ordered the leaders of these fanatics to be seized and punished, and covered the *Lutherans* with bitter reproaches for not having opposed these fanatics in time.]

[(n) It is very remarkable, and shews the equity and candour of GUSTAVUS in the most

CENT. XVI. a conference, at *Upsal*, between this eminent reformer and PETER GALLIUS, a zealous defender of the ancient superstition, in which these two champions were to plead publicly in behalf of their respective opinions, that it might thus be seen on which side the truth lay. This dispute, in which OLAUS obtained a signal victory, contributed much to confirm GUSTAVUS in his persuasion of the truth of LUTHER's doctrine, and to promote the progress of that doctrine in *Sweden*. In the year following, another event gave the finishing stroke to its propagation and success, and this was the assembly of the states at *Westeraas*, where GUSTAVUS recommended the doctrine of the reformers with such zeal, wisdom, and piety, that, after warm debates fomented by the clergy in general, and much opposition on the part of the bishops in particular, it was unanimously resolved, that the plan of reformation proposed by LUTHER should have free admittance among the Swedes [o]. This resolution was principally owing to the firmness and magnanimity of GUSTAVUS, who declared publicly, that he would lay down his scepter and retire from his kingdom, rather than rule a people enslaved to the orders and authority of the pope, and more controlled by the tyranny of their bishops, than by the laws of their monarch [p]. From this time the papal empire in *Sweden* was entirely overturned, and GUSTAVUS declared head of the church.

In *Denmark*.

XXXI. The light of the reformation was also received in *Denmark*, and that so early as the year 1521, in consequence of the ardent desire discovered by CHRISTIAN or CHRISTIERN II, of having his subjects instructed in the principles and doctrines of LUTHER. This monarch, whose savage and infernal cruelty (whether it was the effect of natural temper, or of bad counsels) rendered his name odious and his memory execrable, was never-

striking point of light, that while he ordered OLAUS to publish his literal translation of the sacred writings, he gave permission, at the same time, to the archbishop of *Upsal* to prepare another version suited to the doctrine of the church of *Rome*; that by a careful comparison of both translations with the original, an easier access might be opened to the truth. The bishops, at first, opposed this order, but were, at length, obliged to submit.]

[(o) It was no wonder indeed that the bishops opposed warmly the proposal of GUSTAVUS, since there was no country in *Europe*, where that order and the clergy in general drew greater temporal advantages from the superstition of the times, than in *Sweden* and *Denmark*. The most of the bishops had revenues superior to those of the sovereign, they possessed castles and fortresses that rendered them independent on the crown, enabled them to excite commotions in the kingdom, and gave them a degree of power that was dangerous to the state. They lived in the most dissolute luxury and overgrown opulence, while the nobility of the kingdom were in misery and want.—The resolution formed by the states, assembled at *Westeraas*, did not so much tend to regulate points of doctrine as to reform the discipline of the church, to reduce the opulence and authority of the bishops within their proper bounds, to restore to the impoverished nobility the lands and possessions that their superstitious ancestors had given to an all-devouring clergy, to exclude the prelates from the senate, to take from them their castles, and things of that nature. It was, however, resolved, at the same time, that the church should be provided with able pastors, who should explain the pure word of God to the people in their native tongue; and that no ecclesiastical preferments should be granted without the king's permission. This was a tacit and gentle method of promoting the reformation.]

[p] BAZII *Inventarium Eccles. Sueco-Gothor.* published in 4^{to} at *Lincoping*, in 1642.—SCULTETI *Annales Evangelii Renovati*, in Von der HART *Hist. Litter. Reformat.* part. V. p. 83 & 110.—RAYNAL *Anecdotes Hist. Politiques et Militaires*, tom. i. part. II. p. 1, &c.

theless

theless desirous of delivering his dominions from the superstition and tyranny of *Rome*. For this purpose, in the year 1520, he sent for MARTIN REINARD, one of the disciples of CARLOSTADT, out of *Saxony*, and appointed him professor of divinity at *Hafnia*; and upon his death, which happened the year following, he invited CARLOSTADT himself to fill that important place, which he accepted indeed, but nevertheless, after a short residence in *Denmark*, returned into *Germany*. These disappointments did not abate the reforming spirit of the Danish monarch, who used his utmost endeavours, though in vain, to engage LUTHER to visit his dominions, and took several steps that tended to the diminution and, indeed, to the suppression of the jurisdiction exercised over his subjects by the Roman pontif. It is, however, proper to observe, that in all these proceedings CHRISTIERN II was animated by no other motive than that of ambition. It was the prospect of extending his authority, and not a zeal for the advancement of true religion, that gave life and vigour to his reforming projects. His very actions, independently of what may be concluded from his known character, evidently shew that he protected the religion of LUTHER with no other view than to rise by it to supremacy both in church and state; and that it might afford him a pretext for depriving the bishops of that overgrown authority and those ample possessions which they had gradually usurped [q], and of appropriating them to himself. A revolution produced by his avarice, tyranny, and cruelty prevented the execution of this bold enterprize. The States of the kingdom exasperated, some by the schemes he had laid for destroying the liberty of *Denmark*, others by his attempts to abolish the superstition of their ancestors [r], and all by his savage and barbarous treatment of those who dared to oppose his avarice or ambition, formed a conspiracy against him in the year 1523, by which he was deposed and banished from his dominions, and his uncle, FREDERICK duke of *Holstein* and *Sleswic*, placed on the throne of *Denmark*.

XXXII. This prince conducted matters with much more equity, prudence, and moderation than his predecessor had done. He permitted the protestant doctors to preach publicly the opinions of LUTHER [s], but did not venture so far as to change the established government and discipline of the church. He contributed, however, greatly to the progress of the reformation by his successful attempts, in favour of religious liberty, at the assembly of the states that was held at *Odense* in the year 1527. For it was here that he procured the publication of that famous edict, which declared every subject of *Denmark* free, either to adhere to the tenets of the

The progress of the reformation under the reigns of Frederick and Christiern III.

[q] See JO. GRAMMII *Diff. de Reformatione Daniæ à Christierno tentata*, in the third volume of the *Scriptores Societ. Scientiar. Hafniens.* p. 1—90.

[r] See for a confirmation of this part of the accusation, a curious piece, containing the reasons that induced the states of *Denmark* to renounce their allegiance to CHRISTIERN II. This piece is to be found in the fifth volume of LUDEWIG's compilation, entitled, *Reliquiæ MStorum*, p. 315. in which (p. 321.) the states of *Denmark* express their displeasure at the royal favour shewn to the Lutherans, in the following terms: *Lutheranæ hæresis pullulatores, contra jus pietatemque, in regnum nostrum catholicum introduxit, doctorem Caroloſtadium, fortissimum Lutheri athletam, enutrivit.*

[s] See JO. MOLLERI *Cimbria litterata*, tom. ii. p. 886.—CHRIST. OLIVARII *Vita Pauli Eliæ*, p. 108.—ERICI PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Ecclesiæ Daniæ*, tom. iii. p. 139.

church

CENT. XVI. church of *Rome*, or to embrace the doctrine of LUTHER [t]. Encouraged by this resolution, the protestant divines exercised the functions of their ministry with such zeal and success, that the greatest part of the Danes opened their eyes upon the auspicious beams of sacred liberty, and abandoned gradually both the doctrines and jurisdiction of the church of *Rome*. But the honour of finishing this glorious work, of destroying entirely the reign of superstition, and breaking asunder the bonds of papal tyranny, was reserved for CHRISTIERN III, a prince equally distinguished by his piety and prudence. He began by suppressing the despotic authority of the bishops, and by restoring to their lawful owners a great part of the wealth and possessions which the church had acquired by the artful stratagems of the crafty and designing clergy. This step was followed by a wise and well-judged settlement of religious doctrine, discipline, and worship throughout the kingdom, according to a plan laid down by BUGENHAGIUS, whom the king had sent for from *Wittenberg* to perform that arduous task, for which his eminent piety, learning, and moderation rendered him peculiarly proper. The assembly of the states at *Odensee*, in the year 1539, gave a solemn sanction to all these transactions; and thus the work of the reformation was brought to perfection in *Denmark* [u].

A distinction to be observed when we speak of the reformation of *Sweden* and *Denmark*.

XXXIII. It is, however, to be observed, that, in the history of the reformation of *Sweden* and *Denmark*, we must carefully distinguish between the reformation of religious opinions and the reformation of the episcopal order. For though these two things may appear to be closely connected, yet, in reality, they are so far distinct, that either of the two might have been compleatly transacted without the other. A reformation of doctrine might have been effected without diminishing the authority of the bishops, or suppressing their order; and, on the other hand, the opulence and power of the bishops might have been reduced within proper bounds without introducing any change into the system of doctrine that had been so long established, and that was generally received [w]. In the measures taken in these northern kingdoms, for the reformation of a corrupt doctrine and a superstitious discipline, there was nothing that deserved the smallest censure: neither fraud nor violence were employed for this purpose; on the

[(t) It was farther added to this edict, that no person should be molested on account of his religion, that a royal protection should be granted to the Lutherans to defend them from the insults and malignity of their enemies; and that ecclesiastics, of whatever rank or order, should be permitted to enter into the married state, and to fix their residence, wherever they thought proper, without any regard to monasteries or other religious societies.]

[u] ERICI PONTOPPIDANI, see a German work of the learned PONTOPPIDAN, entitled, *A Compendious View of the History of the Reformation in Denmark*, published at *Lubeck* in 8^{vo} in 1734; as also the *Annales Ecclesiae Danicae*, of the same author, tom. ii. p. 790. tom. iii. p. 1.—HENR. MUHLIUS *de Reformat. religionis in vicinis Danicae regionibus et potissimum in Cimbria, in ejus Dissertationibus Historico-Theologicis*, p. 24. *Kiliae* 1715, in 4^{to}.

[(w) This observation is not worthy of Dr. MOSHEIM's sagacity. The strong connexion that there naturally is between superstitious ignorance among the people and influence and power in their spiritual rulers is too evident to stand in need of any proof. A good clergy will or ought to have an influence, in consequence of a respectable office adorned with learning, piety, and morals. But the power of a licentious and despotic clergy can be only supported by the blind and superstitious credulity of their flock.]

contrary,

contrary, all things were conducted with wisdom and moderation, in a CYNT. XVI. manner suitable to the dictates of equity and the spirit of Christianity. The same judgment cannot easily be pronounced with respect to the methods of proceeding in the reformation of the clergy, and more especially of the episcopal order. For here, certainly, violence was used, and the bishops were deprived of their honours, privileges, and possessions without their consent; and, indeed, notwithstanding the greatest struggles and the warmest opposition [x]. The truth is, that so far as the reformation in *Sweden* and *Denmark* regarded the privileges and possessions of the bishops, it was rather a matter of political expediency than of religious obligation; nay, a change here was become so necessary, that, had *LUTHER* and his doctrine never appeared in the world, it must have been nevertheless attempted by a wise legislator. For the bishops, by a variety of perfidious stratagems, had got into their hands such enormous treasures, such ample possessions, so many castles and fortified towns, and had assumed such an unlimited and despotic authority, that they were in a condition to give law to the sovereign himself, to rule the nation as they thought proper, and had, in effect, already abused their power so far as to appropriate to themselves a considerable part of the royal patrimony, and of the public revenues of the kingdom. Such, therefore, was the critical state of these northern kingdoms, in the time of *LUTHER*, that it became absolutely necessary, either to degrade the bishops from that rank which they dishonoured, and to deprive them of the greatest part of those possessions and prerogatives which they had so unjustly acquired and so licentiously abused, or to see, tamely, royalty rendered contemptible by its weakness, the sovereign deprived of the means of protecting and succouring his people, and the commonwealth exposed to rebellion, misery, and ruin.

XXXIV. The kingdom of *France* was not inaccessible to the light of the reformation. *MARGARET*, queen of *Navarre*, sister to *FRANCIS I.*, the implacable enemy and perpetual rival of *CHARLES V.*, was extremely favour-

The rise and progress of the reformation in *France*.

[(x) What does *Dr. MOSHEIM* mean here? did ever a usurper give up his unjust possessions without reluctance? does rapine constitute a right when it is maintained by force? is it unlawful to use violence against extortioners? The question here is, whether or no the bishops deserved the severe treatment they received from *CHRISTIERN III.*; and our author seems to answer this question in the affirmative, and to declare this treatment both just and necessary in the following part of this section. Certain it is, that the bishops were treated with great severity, deposed from their sees, imprisoned on account of their resistance, all the church-lands, towns, and fortresses annexed to the crown, and the temporal power of the clergy for ever abolished. It is also certain, that *LUTHER* himself looked upon these measures as violent and excessive, and even wrote a letter to *CHRISTIERN*, exhorting him to use the clergy with more lenity. It is therefore proper to decide with moderation on this subject, and to grant, that, if the insolence and licentiousness of the clergy were enormous, the resentment of the Danish monarch may have been excessive. Nor, indeed, was his political prudence here so great as *Dr. MOSHEIM* seems to represent it; for the equipoise of government was hurt by a total suppression of the power of the bishops. The nobility acquired by this a prodigious degree of influence, and the crown lost an order, which, under proper regulations, might have been rendered one of the strongest supports of its prerogative. But disquisitions of this nature are foreign to our purpose. It is only proper to observe, that in the room of the bishops *CHRISTIERN* created an order of men, with the denomination of *superintendants*, who performed the spiritual part of the episcopal office, without sharing the least shadow of temporal authority.]

CENT. XVI. able to the new doctrine, which delivered pure and genuine Christianity from a great part of the superstitions under which it had so long lain disguised. The auspicious patronage of this illustrious princess encouraged several pious and learned men, whose religious sentiments were the same with hers, to propagate the principles of the reformation in *France*, and even to erect several protestant churches in that kingdom. It is manifest from the most authentic records, that, so early as the year 1523, there were, in several of the provinces of that country, multitudes of persons, who had conceived the utmost aversion both to the doctrine and tyranny of *Rome*, and, among these, many persons of rank and dignity, and even some of the episcopal order. As their numbers increased from day to day, and troubles and commotions were excited in several places on account of religious differences, the authority of the monarch and the cruelty of his officers intervened to support the doctrine of *Rome* by the edge of the sword and the terrors of the gibbet; and on this occasion many persons, eminent for their piety and virtue, were put to death with the most unrelenting barbarity [y]. This cruelty, instead of retarding, accelerated rather the progress of the reformation. It is nevertheless true, that under the reign of FRANCIS I the restorers of genuine Christianity were not always equally successful and happy. Their situation was extremely uncertain, and it was perpetually changing. Sometimes they enjoyed the auspicious shade of royal protection; at others they groaned under the weight of persecution, and at certain seasons, they seemed to be forgot, which oblivion rendered their condition tolerable. FRANCIS, who had either no religion at all, or, at best, no fixed and consistent system of religious principles, conducted himself towards the protestants in such a manner as answered his private and personal views, or as reasons of policy and a public interest seemed to require. When it became necessary to engage in his cause the German protestants, in order to foment sedition and rebellion against his mortal enemy CHARLES V, then did he treat the protestants in *France* with the utmost equity, humanity, and gentleness; but so soon as he had gained his point, and had no more occasion for their services, then he threw off the mask, and appeared to them in the aspect of an implacable and persecuting tyrant [z].

About this time the famous CALVIN, whose character, talents, and religious exploits we shall have occasion to dwell upon more amply in the course of this history, began to draw the attention of the public, but more

[y] See BEZE *Histoire des Eglises Reformées de France*, tom. i. livr. i. p. 5.—BENOIT *Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes*, livr. i. p. 6.—CHRIST. AUG. SALIG. *Histor. August. Confession*. vol. ii. p. 190.

[z] The inconsistency and contradiction that were visible in the conduct of FRANCIS I may be attributed to various reasons. At one time we see him resolved to invite MELANCTHON into *France*, probably with a view to please his sister the queen of *Navarre*, whom he loved tenderly, and who had strongly imbibed the principles of the protestants. At another time, we behold him exercising the most infernal cruelty towards the friends of the reformation, and hear him making that mad declaration, *that, if he thought the blood in his arm was tainted with the Lutheran heresy, he would have it cut off; and that he would not spare even his own children, if they entertained sentiments contrary to those of the catholic church.* See FLOR. DE REMOND *Hist. de la Naissance et du progres de l'Herésie*, livr. vii.]

especially of the queen of *Navarre*. He was born at *Noyon* in *Picardy*, CENT. XVI. on the 10th of July 1509, and was bred up to the law [a], in which, as well as in all the other branches of literature, then known, his studies were attended with the most rapid and amazing success. Having acquired the knowledge of religion, by a diligent perusal of the holy scriptures, he began early to perceive the necessity of reforming the established system of doctrine and worship. His zeal exposed him to danger, and the connexions he had formed with the friends of the reformation, whom FRANCIS I was daily committing to the flames, placed him more than once in imminent danger, from which he was delivered by the good offices of the excellent queen of *Navarre*. To escape the impending storm, he retired to *Basil*, where he published his *Christian institutions*; and prefixed to them that famous dedication to FRANCIS I, which has attracted universally the admiration of succeeding ages, and which was designed to soften the unrelenting fury of that prince, against the protestants [b].

XXXV. The instances of an opposition to the doctrine and discipline of *Rome* in the other European states, were few in number, before the diet of *Augsburg*, and were too faint, imperfect, and ambiguous to make much noise in the world. It, however, appears from the most authentic testimonies, that, even before that period, the doctrine of LUTHER had made a considerable, though perhaps a secret, progress in *Spain*, *Hungary*, *Bohemia*, *Britain*, *Poland*, and the *Netherlands*, and had, in all these countries, many friends, of whom several repaired to *Wittenberg* to improve their knowledge and enlarge their views under such an eminent master. Some of these countries openly broke asunder the chains of superstition, and withdrew themselves, in a public and constitutional manner, from the jurisdiction of the Roman pontif. In others, a prodigious number of families received the light of the blessed reformation, rejected the doctrines and authority of *Rome*; and, notwithstanding the calamities and persecutions they have suffered, on account of their sentiments, under the scepter of bigotry and superstition, continue still in the profession of the pure doctrine of Christianity. While in other, still more unhappy, lands, the most barbarous tortures, the most infernal spirit of cruelty, together with penal laws adapted to strike terror into the firmest minds, have extinguished, almost totally, the light of religious truth. It is, indeed, certain, and the Roman catholics themselves acknowledge it without hesitation, that the papal doctrines, jurisdiction, and authority, would have fallen into ruin in all parts

And in the other
states of *Europe*,

[(a) He was originally designed for the church, and had actually obtained a benefice: but the light, that broke in upon his religious sentiments, as well as the preference given by his father to the profession of the law, induced him to give up his ecclesiastic vocation, which he afterwards resumed in a purer church.]

[(b) This paragraph, relating to CALVIN, is added to Dr. MOSHEIM's text by the translator, who was surprized to find in a History of the Reformation, such late mention made of one of its most distinguished and remarkable instruments; a man whose extensive genius, flowing eloquence, immense learning, extraordinary penetration, indefatigable industry, and fervent piety placed him at the head of the reformers, all of whom he surpassed, at least, in learning and parts, as he also did the most of them, in obstinacy, asperity, and turbulence.]

CENT. XVI. of the world, had not the force of the secular arm been employed to support this tottering edifice, and fire and sword been let loose upon those who were assailing it only with reason and argument.

C H A P. III.

The History of the Reformation, from the time that the confession of Augsberg was presented to the emperor, until the commencement of the war which succeeded the league of Smalcald.

The confession of Augsberg presented to Charles V.

I. CHARLES V arrived at *Augsburg* the 15th of June 1530, and, on the twentieth day of the same month, the diet was opened. As it was unanimously agreed, that the affairs of religion should be brought upon the carpet before the deliberations, relating to the intended war with the Turks, the protestant members of this great assembly received from the emperor a formal permission to present to the diet, on the 25th of June, an account of their religious principles and tenets. In consequence of this, CHRISTIAN BAYER, chancellor of Saxony, read, in the German language, in presence of the emperor, and the assembled princes, the famous confession, which has been since distinguished by the denomination of the *confession of Augsburg*. The princes heard it with the deepest attention and recollection of mind; it confirmed some in the principles they had embraced, surprized others, and many, who before this time, had little or no idea of the religious sentiments of LUTHER, were now, not only convinced of their innocence, but were, moreover, delighted with their purity and simplicity. The copies of this *confession*, which, after being read, were delivered to the emperor, were signed and subscribed by JOHN, elector of Saxony, by four princes of the empire, GEORGE, marquis of Brandenburg, ERNEST, duke of Lunenburg, PHILIP, landgrave of Hesse, WOLFGANG, prince of Anhalt, and by the imperial cities of Nuremberg and Reutlingen, who all thereby solemnly declared their assent to the doctrines contained in it [c].

The nature and contents of the confession of Augsburg.

II. The tenor and contents of the confession of *Augsburg* are well known, at least, by all who have the smallest acquaintance with ecclesiastical history; since that confession was adopted by the whole body of the protestants as the rule of their faith. The style, that reigns in it, is plain, elegant, grave, and perspicuous, such as becomes the nature of the subject, and such as might be expected from the admirable pen of MELANCTHON. The matter was, undoubtedly, supplied by LUTHER, who, during the diet, resided at Coburg, a town in the neighbourhood of *Augsburg*; and, even the form it

[c] There is a very voluminous history of this diet, which was published in the year 1577, in folio, at *Frankfort on Oder*, by the laborious GEORGE CELESTINE. The history of the *Confession of Augsburg* was composed, in Latin, by DAVID CHYTRÆUS, and more recently, in German, by ERN. SOLOM. CYPRIAN and CHRISTOPHER AUG. SALIG. The performance of the latter is rather, indeed, a history of the *Reformation* in general, than of the *Confession of Augsburg* in particular. That of CYPRIAN is more concise and elegant, and is confirmed by original pieces, which are equally authentic and curious.

received

received from the eloquent pen of his colleague, was authorised in consequence of his approbation and advice. This *confession* contains twenty eight chapters, of which the greatest part [d] are employed in representing, with perspicuity and truth, the religious opinions of the protestants, and the rest in pointing out the errors and abuses that occasioned their separation from the church of *Rome* [e].

III. The creatures of the Roman pontif, who were present at this diet, employed JOHN FABER, afterwards bishop of *Vienna*, together with ECKIUS and another doctor, named, COCKLÆUS, to draw up a refutation of this famous confession. This pretended refutation, having been read publicly in the assembly, the emperor demanded of the protestant members that they would acquiesce in it, and put an end to their religious debates by an unlimited submission to the doctrines and opinions contained in this answer. But this demand was far from being complied with. The protestants declared, on the contrary, that they were, by no means, satisfied with the reply of their adversaries, and earnestly desired a copy of it, that they might demonstrate more fully its extreme insufficiency and weakness. This reasonable request was refused by the emperor, who, on this occasion, as well as on several others, shewed more regard to the importunity of the pope's legate and his party, than to the demands of equity, candor, and justice. He even interposed his supreme authority to suspend any farther proceeding in this matter, and solemnly prohibited the publication of any new writings or declarations that might contribute to lengthen out these religious debates. This, however, did not reduce the protestants to silence. The divines of that communion, who had been present at the diet, endeavoured to recollect the arguments and objections employed by FABER, and had again recourse to the pen of MELANCTHON, who refuted them, in an ample and satisfactory manner, in a learned piece that was presented to the emperor on the 22^d of September; but which that prince refused to receive. This answer was afterwards enlarged by MELANCTHON, when he had obtained a copy of FABER's reply, and was published in the year 1531, with the other pieces that related to the doctrine and discipline of the Lutheran church, under the title of *A defence of the confession of Augsburg*.

The Roman catholics attempt a refutation of the confession of *Augsburg*.

IV. There were only three ways left of bringing to a conclusion these religious differences, which it was, in reality, most difficult to reconcile. The first and the most rational method was, to grant to those, who refused to submit to the doctrine and jurisdiction of *Rome*, the liberty of following

Deliberations concerning the method to be used in terminating these religious dissensions.

[d] XXI chapters were so employed; the other VII contained a detail of the errors and superstitious of the church of *Rome*.

[e] It is proper to observe here, that, while the Lutherans presented their *Confession* to the diet, another excellent *Remonstrance* of the same nature was addressed to this august assembly by the cities of *Straßburg*, *Constance*, *Memingen*, and *Lindaw*, which had rejected the errors and jurisdiction of *Rome*, but did not enter into the Lutheran league, because they adopted the opinions of ZUINGLE in relation to the eucharist. The declaration of these four towns (which was called the *Tetrapolitan Confession*, on account of their number) was drawn up by the excellent MARTIN BUCER, and was considered as a master-piece of reasoning and eloquence not only by the protestants, but even by several of the Roman catholics; and among others by Mr. DUPIN. ZUINGLE also sent to this diet a private confession of his religious opinions.]

CENT. XVI.

their private judgment in matters of a religious nature, the privilege of serving God according to the dictates of their conscience, and all this, in such a manner, that the public tranquillity should not be disturbed. The second, shortest, and most iniquitous expedient, was to end these dissensions by military apostles, who, sword in hand, should force the protestants to return to the bosom of the church, and to court the papal yoke, which they had so magnanimously thrown off their necks. Some thought of a middle way, which lay equally remote from the difficulties, that attended the two methods now mentioned, and proposed, that a reconciliation should be made upon fair, candid, and equitable terms, by engaging each of the contending parties to temper their zeal with moderation, to abate reciprocally the rigour of their pretensions, and remit something of their respective claims. This method, which seemed agreeable to the dictates of reason, charity, and justice, was highly approved of by several wise and good men on both sides; but it was ill-suited to the arrogant ambition of the Roman pontif, and the superstitious ignorance of the times, which beheld, with horror, whatever tended to introduce the sweets of religious liberty, or the exercise of private judgment. The second method, even the use of violence, and the terrors of the sword, was more agreeable to the spirit and sentiments of the age, and was peculiarly suited to the despotic genius and sanguine counsels of the court of *Rome*; but the emperor had prudence and equity enough to make him reject it, and it appeared shocking to those, who were not lost to all sentiments of justice or moderation. The third expedient was therefore most generally approved of; it was peculiarly agreeable to all, who were zealous for the interests and tranquillity of the empire, nor did the Roman pontif seem to look upon it either with aversion or contempt. Hence various conferences were held between persons of eminence, piety, and learning, who were chosen for that purpose from both sides, and nothing was omitted that might have the least tendency to calm the animosity, heal the divisions, and unite the hearts of the contending parties [f]; but all to no purpose, since the difference between their opinions was too considerable, and of too much importance to admit of a reconciliation. It was in these conferences that the spirit and character of MELANCTHON appeared in their true and genuine colours; and it was here that the votaries of *Rome* exhausted their efforts to gain over to their party this pillar of the reformation, whose abilities and virtues added such a lustre to the protestant cause. This humane and gentle spirit was apt to sink into a kind of yield-

[f] As in the confession of *Augsburg* there were three sorts of articles, one sort orthodox, and adopted by both sides; another that consisted of certain propositions, which the papal party considered as ambiguous and obscure; and a third, in which the doctrine of LUTHER was entirely opposite to that of *Rome*; this gave some reason to hope that, by the means of certain concessions and modifications, conducted mutually by a spirit of candour and charity, matters might be accommodated at last. For this purpose select persons were appointed to carry on this salutary work, at first seven from each party, consisting of princes, lawyers, and divines, which number was afterwards reduced to three. LUTHER's obstinate, stubborn, and violent temper, rendering him unfit for healing divisions, he was not employed in these conferences, but he was constantly consulted by the protestant party; and it was with a view to this that he resided at *Coburg*.

ing

ing softness under the influence of mild and generous treatment. And, CENT. XVI. accordingly, while his adversaries soothed him fair words and flattering promises, he seemed to melt as they spoke, and, in some measure, to comply with their demands: but when they so far forgot themselves as to make use of imperious language and menacing terms, then did MELANCTHON appear in a very different point of light; then a spirit of intrepidity, ardor, and independence animated all his words and actions, and he looked down with contempt on the threats of power, the frowns of fortune, and the fear of death. The truth is, that, in this great and good man, a soft and yielding temper was joined with the most inviolable fidelity, and the most invincible attachment to the truth.

V. This reconciling method of terminating the religious debates, between the friends of liberty and the votaries of *Rome*, proving ineffectual; the latter had recourse to other measures, which were suited to the iniquity of the times, though they were equally disavowed by the dictates of reason, and the precepts of the gospel. These measures were the force of the secular arm, and the authority of imperial edicts. On the 19th day of November, a severe decree was issued out by the express order of the emperor, during the absence of the Hessian and Saxon princes, who were the chief supporters of the protestant cause; and, in this decree, every thing was manifestly adapted to deject the friends of religious liberty, if we except a faint and dubious promise of engaging the pope to assemble (in about six months after the separation of the diet) a general council. The dignity and excellence of the papal religion are extolled, beyond measure, in this partial decree, a new degree of severity and force added to that which had been published at *Worms* against LUTHER and his adherents, the changes that had been introduced into the doctrine and discipline of the protestant churches, severely censured, and a solemn order addressed to the princes, states, and cities, that had thrown off the papal yoke, to return to their duty and their allegiance to *Rome*, on pain of incurring the indignation and vengeance of the emperor, as the patron, and protector of the church [g].

The result of these conferences.

VI. No sooner were the elector of *Saxony* and the confederate princes informed of this deplorable issue of the diet of *Augsborg*, than they assembled in order to deliberate upon the measures that were proper to be taken on this critical occasion. In the year 1530, and the year following, they met, first at *Smalcald*, afterwards at *Frankfort*, and formed a solemn alliance and confederacy, with the intention of defending vigorously their religion and liberties against the dangers and encroachments with which they were menaced by the edict of *Augsborg*, without attempting, however, any thing, properly speaking, offensive against the votaries of *Rome*. Into this confederacy they invited the kings of *England*, *France*, and *Denmark*, with several

The league of Smalcald.

[g] To give the greater degree of weight to this edict it was resolved, that no judge, who refused to approve and subscribe its contents, should be admitted into the imperial chamber of *Spire*, which is the supreme court in *Germany*. The emperor also and the popish princes engaged themselves to employ their united forces in order to maintain its authority, and to promote its execution.]

CENT. XIV. other republics and states, and left no means unemployed that might tend to corroborate and cement this important alliance [b]. Amidst these motions and preparations, which portended an approaching rupture, the elector *Palatine*, and the elector of *Mentz*, offered their mediation, and endeavoured to reconcile the contending princes. With respect to the emperor, various reasons united to turn his views towards peace. For, on the one hand, he stood in need of succours against the Turk, which the protestant princes refused to grant as long as the edicts of *Worms* and *Augsburg* remained in force; and, on the other, the election of his brother FERDINAND to the dignity of king of the Romans, which had been concluded by a majority of votes, at the diet of *Cologne*, in the year 1531, was contested by the same princes as contrary to the fundamental laws of the empire.

The peace of
Nuremberg.

VII. In this troubled state of affairs many projects of reconciliation were proposed, and, after various negotiations, a treaty of peace was concluded at *Nuremberg*, in the year 1532, between the emperor and the protestant princes on the following conditions; that the latter should furnish a subsidy for carrying on the war against the Turk, and acknowledge FERDINAND lawful king of the Romans; and that the emperor, on his part, should abrogate and annul the edicts of *Worms* and *Augsburg*, and allow the Lutherans the free and unmolested exercise of their religious doctrine and discipline, until a rule of faith was fixed either in the free general council that was to be assembled in the space of six months, or in a diet of the empire.

[(b) LUTHER, who, at first, seemed averse to this confederacy from an apprehension of the calamities and troubles it might produce, perceiving, at length, its necessity, consented to it; but, uncharitably as well as imprudently, refused comprehending in it the followers of ZUINGLE among the Swiss, together with the German states or cities, which had adopted the sentiments and confession of BUCER. And yet we find that the cities of *Ulm* and *Augsburg* had embraced the reformation on the principles of ZUINGLE.—In the invitation addressed to HENRY VIII, king of *England*, whom the confederate princes were willing to declare the head and protector of their league, the following things were expressly stipulated among several others: viz. That the king should encourage, promote, and maintain the true doctrine of Christ, as it was contained in the confession of *Augsburg*, and defend the same at the next general council;—that he should not agree to any council summoned by the bishop of *Rome*, but protest against it, and neither submit to its decrees, nor suffer them to be respected in his dominions;—that he should never allow the Roman pontif to have any pre-eminence or jurisdiction in his dominions;—that he should advance 100,000 crowns for the use of the confederacy, and double that sum if it became necessary; all which articles the confederate princes were obliged equally to observe on their part. To these demands the king answered, immediately, in a manner that was not satisfactory. He declared that he would maintain and promote the true doctrine of Christ, but, at the same time, as the true ground of that doctrine lay only in the Holy Scriptures, he would not accept, at any one's hand, what should be his faith, or that of his kingdoms, and therefore desired they would send over learned men to confer with him in order to promote a religious union between him and the confederates. He moreover declared himself of their opinion with respect to the meeting of a free general council, promised to join with them, in all such councils, for the defence of the true doctrine, but thought the regulation of the ceremonial part of religion, being a matter of indifference, ought to be left to the choice of each sovereign for his own dominions. After this the king gave them a second answer more full and satisfactory; but upon the fall of queen ANNE, this negotiation came to nothing. On the one hand, the king grew cold, when he perceived that the confederates could be of no longer service to him in supporting the validity of his marriage; and, on the other, the German princes were sensible that they could never succeed with HENRY, unless they would allow him an absolute dictatorship in matters of religion.]

The

The apprehension of an approaching rupture was scarcely removed by CENT. XVI. this agreement, when JOHN, elector of *Saxony*, died, and was succeeded by his son JOHN FREDERICK, a prince of invincible fortitude and magnanimity, whose reign was little better than a continued scene of disappointments and calamities.

VIII. The religious truce, concluded at *Nuremberg* inspired with new vigour and resolution all the friends of the reformation. It gave strength to the feeble, and perseverance to the bold. Encouraged by it, those, who had been hitherto only secret enemies to the Roman pontif, spurned now his yoke publicly, and refused to submit to his imperious jurisdiction. This appears from the various cities and provinces in *Germany*, which, about this time, boldly enlisted themselves under the religious standards of LUTHER. On the other hand, as all hope of terminating the religious debates, that divided *Europe*, was founded in the meeting of the general council, which had been so solemnly promised, the emperor renewed his earnest requests to CLEMENT VII, that he would hasten an event that was expected and desired with so much impatience. The pontif, whom the history of past councils filled with the most uneasy and discouraging apprehensions, endeavoured to retard, what he could not, with any decency, absolutely refuse [i]. He formed innumerable pretexts to put off the evil day; and his whole conduct evidently shewed, that he was more desirous of having these religious differences decided by the force of arms, than by the power of argument. He, indeed, in the year 1533, made a proposal, by his legate, to assemble a council at *Mantua*, *Placentia*, or *Bologna*; but the protestants refused their consent to the nomination of an Italian council, and insisted, that a controversy, which had its rise in the heart of *Germany*, should be decided within the limits of the empire. The pope by his usual artifices eluded his own promise, disappointed their expectations, and was cut off by death, in the year 1534, in the midst of his stratagems [k].

A council expected in vain

IX. His successor PAUL III seemed to shew less reluctance to the assembling a general council, and appeared even disposed to comply with the desires of the emperor in that respect. Accordingly, in the year 1535, he expressed his inclination to convoke one at *Mantua*; and, the year following, actually sent circular letters for that purpose through all the kingdoms and states under his jurisdiction [l]. The protestants, on the other hand,

[i] Besides the fear of seeing his authority diminished by a general council, another reason engaged CLEMENT VII to avoid an assembly of that nature, for being conscious of the illegitimacy of his birth, as *Frao Paulo* observes, he had ground to fear that the *Calenna's*, or his other enemies might plead this circumstance before the council, as a reason for his exclusion from the pontificate; since it might be well questioned, whether a *bastard* could be a pope, though it is known from many instances, that a *profligate* may.]

[k] See an ample account of every thing relative to this council, in *FRA. PAULO's History of the Council of Trent*, book I.

[l] This council was summoned, by PAUL III, to assemble at *Mantua* on the 23^d of May 1537, by a bull issued out the 2^d of June of the preceding year. Several obstacles prevented its meeting. FREDERICK, duke of *Mantua*, was not much inclined to receive, at once, so many guests, and some of them turbulent ones, into the place of his residence.]

fully

CENT. XVI. fully persuaded, that in such a council [m], all things would be carried by the votaries of *Rome*, and nothing concluded, but what should be agreeable to the sentiments and ambition of the pontif, assembled at *Smalcald* in the year 1537. And there they protested solemnly against such a partial and corrupt council, as that which was convoked by PAUL III; but, at the same time, had a new *summary* of their doctrine drawn up by LUTHER, in order to present it to the assembled bishops, if it was required of them. This summary, which was distinguished by the title of the *Articles of Smalcald*, is generally joined with the creeds and confessions of the Lutheran church.

New outrages
committed by
the anabaptists.

X. During these transactions two remarkable events happened, of which the one was most detrimental to the cause of religion in general, to that of the reformation in particular, and produced, in *Germany*, civil tumults and commotions of the most horrid kind; while the other was more salutary in its consequences and effects, and struck at the very root of the papal authority and dominion. The former of these events was a new sedition kindled by a fanatical and outrageous mob of the *anabaptists*; and the latter, the rupture between HENRY VIII king of *England*, and the Roman pontif, whose jurisdiction and spiritual supremacy were publicly renounced by that rough and resolute monarch.

In the year 1533, there came to *Munster*, a city in *Westphalia*, a certain number of *anabaptists*, who surpassed the rest of that fanatical tribe in the extravagance of their proceedings, the frenzy of their disordered brains, and the madness of their pretensions and projects. They gave themselves out for the messengers of heaven, invested with a divine commission to lay the foundations of a new government, a holy and spiritual empire, and to destroy and overturn all temporal rule and authority, all human and political institutions. Having turned all things into confusion and uproar in the city of *Munster* by this seditious and extravagant declaration, they began to erect a new republic [n], conformable to their absurd and chimerical notions of religion, and committed the administration of it to JOHN BOCKHOLT, a taylor by profession, and a native of *Leyden*. Their reign, however, was of a short duration; for, in the year 1535, the city was besieged and taken by the bishop of *Munster*, assisted by other German princes, this fanatical king and his wrong-headed associates put to death in the most terrible and ignominious manner, and the new hierarchy destroyed with its furious and extravagant founders. This disorderly and outrageous conduct of an handful of anabaptists, drew upon the whole body heavy marks of displeasure from the greatest part of the European princes. The severest laws were enacted against them for the second time, in consequence

[(m) That is, in a council, assembled by the authority of the pope alone, and that also in *Italy*, two circumstances that must have greatly contributed to give PAUL III an undue influence in that assembly. The protestants maintained, that the emperor and the other christian princes of *Europe* had a right to be *authoritatively* concerned in calling a general council, and that, so much the more, that the Roman pontif was evidently one of the parties in the present debate.]

[n] This fanatical establishment they distinguished by the title of the *New Jerusalem*.

of which the innocent and the guilty were involved in the same terrible fate, *Cent. XVI* and prodigious numbers devoted to death in the most dreadful forms [o].

XI. The pillars of papal despotism were at this time shaken in *England* by an event, which, at first, did not seem to promise such important consequences. HENRY VIII, a prince, who in vices and in abilities, was surpassed by none who swayed the scepter in this age, and who, in the beginning of these religious troubles, had opposed the doctrine and views of LUTHER with the utmost vehemence, was the principal agent in this great revolution [p]. Bound in the chains of matrimony to CATHARINE of *Aragon*, aunt to CHARLES V, but, at the same time, captivated by the charms of an illustrious virgin whose name was ANNA BOLEYN, he ardently desired to be divorced from the former, that he might render lawful his passion for the latter [q]. For this purpose he addressed himself to the Roman pontif CLEMENT VII, in order to obtain a dissolution of his marriage with CATHARINE, alledging, that a principle of religion restrained him from enjoying any longer the sweets of conjugal love with that princess, as she had been previously married to his elder brother, ARTHUR, and as it was repugnant to the divine law, to contract wedlock with a brother's widow. CLEMENT was greatly perplexed upon this occasion by the apprehension of incurring the indignation of the emperor in case his decision was favourable to HENRY, and therefore he contrived various pretexts to evade a positive answer, and exhausted all his policy and artifice to cajole and deceive the English monarch. Tired with the pretexts, apologies, vain promises and tardy proceedings of the Roman pontif, HENRY had recourse, for the accomplishment of his purposes, to an expedient which

Great Britain renounces the spiritual jurisdiction and supremacy of the Roman pontif.

[o] HERMANNI HAMMELMANNI *Historia Ecclesiast. renati Evangelii per inferiorem Saxoniam et Westphal.* part. II. p. 1196. Opp.—DE PRINZ *Specimen Historiæ Anabapt.* &c. x. 11. p. 104.

[p] This sect was, in process of time, considerably reformed by the ministry of two Frislanders, URBO and MENNON, who purified it from the enthusiastic, seditious, and atrocious principles of its first founders, as will be seen in the progress of this history.]

[q] Among the various portraits that have been given by historians of HENRY VIII, there is none that equals the masterly one drawn by Mr. FROB, in his *History of England*, under the house of TUDOR. This great painter, whose colouring, in other subjects, is sometimes more awful than accurate, has caught from nature the striking lines of HENRY's motley character, and thrown them into a composition, in which they appear with the greatest truth, set out with all the powers of expression.]

[r] From Dr. MOSHEIM's manner of expressing himself, an uninformèd reader might be led to conclude, that the charms of ANNA BOLEYN, were the only motive that engaged HENRY to dissolve his marriage with CATHARINE. But this representation of the matter is not accurate. The king had entertained scruples concerning the legitimacy of his marriage, before his acquaintance with the beautiful and unfortunate ANNE. Conversant in the writings of THOMAS AQUINAS and other schoolmen, who looked upon the Levitical law as of moral and permanent obligation, and attentive to the remonstrances of the bishops, who declared his marriage unlawful, the king was filled with anxious doubts that had made him break off all conjugal commerce with the queen, before his affections had been engaged by any other. This appears by Cardinal WOLSELEY's proposing a marriage between his majesty and the sister of FRANCIS I, which that pliant counsellor would never have done, had he known that the king's affections were otherwise engaged. After all, it is very possible, that the age and infirmities of CATHARINE, together with the blooming charms of ANNA BOLEYN, tended much to animate HENRY's remorse, and to render his conscience more scrupulous. See BURNET's *History of the Reformation*. HUME's *History of the House of Tudor*, p. 150.]

CENT. XVI.

The nature and effects of this first step towards the reformation in England.

was suggested by the famous THOMAS CRANMER, who was a secret friend to LUTHER and his cause, and who was afterwards raised to the see of Canterbury. This expedient was, to demand the opinions of the most learned European universities concerning the subject of his scruples. The result of this measure was favourable to his views. The greatest part of the universities declared the marriage, with a brother's widow, unlawful. CATHARINE was consequently divorced; ANNA conducted by a formal marriage into the royal bed, notwithstanding the remonstrances of CLEMENT, and the English nation delivered from the tyranny of Rome; by HENRY's renouncing the jurisdiction and supremacy of its imperious pontiff. Soon after this, HENRY was declared by the parliament and people *supreme head, on earth, of the church of England*, the monasteries were suppressed, and their revenues applied to other purposes; and the power and authority of the pope were abrogated and entirely overturned [r].

The nature and effects of this first step towards the reformation in England.

XII. It is, however, carefully to be observed here, that this downfall of the papal authority in England, was not productive of much benefit either to the friends or to the cause of the reformation. For the same monarch who had so resolutely withdrawn himself from the dominion of Rome, yet superstitiously retained the greatest part of its errors, along with its imperious and persecuting spirit. He still adhered to several of the most monstrous doctrines of popery, and frequently presented the terrors of death to those who differed from him in their religious sentiments. Besides; he considered the title of *Head of the English church*, as if it transferred to him the enormous power which had been claimed, and indeed usurped, by the Roman pontiffs; and, in consequence of this interpretation of his title, he looked upon himself as master of the religious sentiments of his subjects, and as authorized to prescribe modes of faith according to his fancy. Hence it came to pass, that during the life and reign of this prince, the face of religion was constantly changing, and thus resembled the capricious and unsteady character of its new chief. The prudence, learning, and activity of CRANMER, archbishop of Canterbury, who was the favorite of the king, and the friend of the reformation, counteracted however, in many instances, the humour, and vehemence of this inconstant and turbulent monarch. The pious productions and wise counsels of that venerable prelate diminished daily the influence of the ancient superstitions, dispelled by degrees the mists of ignorance that blinded the people in favour of popery, and increased considerably the number of those who wished well to the reformation [s].

[r] Besides the full and accurate account of this and other important events that is to be found in bishop BURNET's excellent *History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, the curious reader will do well to consult the records of this memorable revolution in WILKINS's *Concil. Magna Britanniae et Hiberniae*, tom. iii. p. 424.—RAYNAL *Anecdotes Historiques, Politiques, Militaires*, tom. i. part. II. p. 90.—*Gen. Dictionary*, at the article BOLEYN.

[s] Besides BURNET's *History of the Reformation*, see NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. i. chap. p. 11.

XIII. After

XIII. After the meeting of the council of *Mantua* was prevented, various measures were taken, and many schemes proposed by the emperor on the one hand, and the protestant princes on the other, for the restoration of concord and union, both civil and religious. But these measures and projects were unattended with any solid or salutary fruit, and were generally disconcerted by the intrigues and artifice of *Rome*, whose legates and creatures, were always lying in wait to blow the flame of discord in all those counsels, that seemed unfavourable to the ambition of its pontifs. In the year 1541, the emperor, regardless of the frowns of the bishop of *Rome*, appointed a conference at *Worms*, on the subject of Religion, between persons of piety and learning chosen from the contending parties. It was here that MELANCTHON and ECKIUS disputed during the space of three days [t]. This conference was, for certain reasons, removed to the diet which was held at *Ratisbon* that same year, and in which the principal subject of deliberation was, a memorial presented by a person unknown, containing a project of peace, with the terms of accommodation, that were proper to terminate these religious differences [u]. This conference, however, produced no other effect, than a mutual agreement of the contending parties to refer the decision of their pretensions and debates to a general council, or, if the meeting of such a council should be prevented by any unforeseen obstacles, to the next German diet.

CENT. XVI.

A new project of pacification.

Conference of Worms.

Diet of Ratisbon.

XIV. This resolution was rendered ineffectual by the period of perplexity and trouble that succeeded the diet of *Ratisbon*; and by various incidents that widened the breach, and put off to a farther day the deliberations that were designed to heal it. It is true, the Roman pontif ordered his legate to declare in the diet, which was assembled at *Spire* in the year 1542, that he would, according to the promise he had already made, assemble a general council, and that *Trent* should be the place of its meeting, if the diet had no objection to that city. FERDINAND, king of the Romans, and the princes, who adhered to the papal cause, gave their consent to this proposal; while the protestant members of the diet objected both against a council summoned by the papal authority alone, and also against the place appointed for its meeting, and demanded a free and lawful council, which should not be biassed by the dictates, nor awed by the proximity of the Roman pontif. This protestation produced no effect, PAUL III persisted in his purpose, and issued out his circular letters for the convocation of the council [w], with the ap-

All things tend to an open rupture.

[t] See Jo. ANDR. ROEDER *Libellus de Colloquio Wormatiensi Norimb.* 1744, in 4^{to}.

[u] See Jo. ERDMANN BIECKII *Triplex Interim*, cap. i. p. 1.

[w] It is proper to observe here, that having summoned, successively, a council at *Mantua*, *Vicenza*, and *Venice*, without any effect*, this pontif thought it necessary to shew the protestants that he was not averse to every kind of reformation; and therefore appointed four cardinals, and three other persons, eminent for their learning, to draw up a plan for the reformation of the church in general, and of the church of *Rome* in particular, knowing full well, by the spirit which reigned in the conclave, that this project would come to nothing. A plan, however, was drawn up by the persons appointed for that purpose. The reformation, proposed in this plan, was indeed extremely superficial and partial; yet it contains some particulars which scarcely could have been expected from the pens of those that composed it. They complained, for instance, of the pride and igno-

* This council was never assembled.

CENT. XVI. probation of the emperor; while this prince endeavoured, at the diet of Worms, in the year 1545, to persuade the protestants to consent to the meeting of this council at Trent. But the protestants were fixed in their resolution, and the efforts of CHARLES were vain. Upon which the emperor, who had hitherto disapproved of the violent measures which were incessantly suggested by the court of Rome, departed from his usual prudence and moderation, and, listening to the sanguine counsels of PAUL, formed, in conjunction with that subtle pontif, the design of terminating the debates about religion by the force of arms. The landgrave of Hesse and the elector of Saxony, who were the chief protectors of the protestant cause, were no sooner informed of this, than they took the proper measures to prevent their being surprized and overwhelmed unawares by a superior force, and, accordingly, raised an army for their defence. While this terrible storm was rising, LUTHER, whose aversion to all methods of violence and force in matters of religion was well known, and who recommended prayer and patience as the only arms worthy of those who had the cause of genuine Christianity at heart, was removed by providence from this scene of tumult, and the approaching calamities that threatened his country. He died in peace on the 18th of February, in the year 1546, at *Aysleben*, the place of his birth.

C H A P. IV.

The History of the Reformation, from the commencement of the war of Smalcald to the famous Pacification, commonly called the PEACE OF RELIGION, concluded at Augsburg.

The commence-
ment of the war
of Smalcald.

I, **T**HE emperor and the pope had mutually resolved the destruction of all who should dare to oppose the council of Trent. The meeting of that assembly was to serve as a signal for their taking arms; and, ac-

rance of the bishops, and proposed that none should receive orders but learned and pious men; and that, therefore, care should be taken to have proper masters to instruct the youth. They condemned translations from one benefice to another, grants of reservation, non-residence, and pluralities. They proposed that some convents should be abolished; that the liberty of the press should be restrained and limited; that the colloquies of ERASMUS should be suppressed; that no ecclesiastic should enjoy a benefice out of his own country; that no cardinal should have a bishopric; that the questors of St. Anthony, and several other saints, should be abolished; and, which was the best of all their proposals, that the effects and personal estate of ecclesiastics should be given to the poor. They concluded with complaining of the prodigious number of indigent and ragged priests that frequented St. Peter's church; and declared, that it was a great scandal to see the whores lodged so magnificently at Rome, and riding, through the streets, on fine mules, while the cardinals and other ecclesiastics accompanied them in a most courteous and familiar manner. The several articles of this plan of reformation (which LUTHER and STURMIUS of *Straßburg* turned into ridicule, and which, indeed, left unredressed, the most intolerable grievances of which the protestants complained) were published at *Antwerp* in, or about, the year 1539, with the answer of COCHLEUS to the objections of STURMIUS. They are likewise prefixed to the *History of the council of Trent*, by CRABRE, and were afterwards published at *Paris* in 1612 †.

† See PAULIN, in *Paul III.* *Shid.* l. xii. *Univ. Mod. Hist.* vol. xxvi. p. 30.

cordingly,

cordingly, its deliberations were scarcely begun, in the year 1546, when the protestants perceived undoubted marks of the approaching storm, and of a formidable union between the emperor and the pontif to overwhelm and crush them by a sudden blow. There had been, 'tis true, a new conference this very year at the diet of *Ratisbon* between some eminent doctors of both parties, with a view to the accommodation of their religious differences; but it appeared sufficiently both from the nature of this dispute, the manner it was carried on, and its issue and result, that the matters in debate would, sooner or later, be decided in the field of battle. In the mean time, the fathers, assembled in the council of *Trent*, promulgated their decrees: while the protestant princes in the diet of *Ratisbon* protested against their authority, and were, in consequence of this, proscribed by the emperor, who raised an army to reduce them to obedience.

II. The elector of *Saxony* and the landgrave of *Hesse* led their forces into *Bavaria* against the emperor, and cannonaded his camp at *Ingolstadt* with great spirit. It was supposed that this would bring the two armies to a general action; but several circumstances prevented a battle, which was expected by the most of the confederates, and, probably, would have been advantageous to their cause. Among these we may reckon, principally, the perfidy of MAURICE, duke of *Saxony*, who, seduced by the promises of the emperor on the one hand, and by his own ambition and avarice on the other, invaded the electoral dominions of his uncle JOHN FREDERICK, while that worthy prince was maintaining against the emperor the sacred cause of religion and liberty. Add to this the divisions that were fomented by the dissimulation of the emperor among the confederate princes; the failure of *France* in furnishing the subsidy that had been promised by its monarch; and other incidents of less moment. All these things discouraged so the heads of the protestant party, that their army was soon dispersed, and the elector of *Saxony* directed his march homewards. But he was pursued by the emperor, who made several forced marches with a view to destroy his enemy, before he should have time to recover his vigour, in which design he was assisted by the ill-grounded security of the elector, and, as there is too much reason to think, by the treachery of his officers. The two armies drew up in order of battle near *Muhlberg* on the *Elbe*, on the 24th of April, 1547; and, after a bloody action, that of the elector, being inferior in numbers, was entirely defeated, and himself taken prisoner. PHILIP, landgrave of *Hesse*, the other chief of the protestants, was persuaded by the entreaties of his son-in-law, MAURICE, now declared elector of *Saxony* [x], to throw himself upon the mercy of the emperor, and to implore his pardon. To this he consented, relying on the promise of CHARLES for obtaining forgiveness, and being restored to liberty; but notwithstanding these expectations he was unjustly detained prisoner by a scandalous violation of the most solemn convention. It is said that the emperor retracted his promise, and deluded this unhappy prince by the ambiguity of two German words;

The affairs of the protestants take an unfavourable turn.

[x] In the room of JOHN FREDERICK, whom he had so basely betrayed.]

which

CENT. XVI. which resemble each other [y]; but this point of history has not been hitherto so far cleared up, as to enable us to judge with certainty concerning the confinement of this prince, and the real causes to which it was owing [z].

The famous temporary edict, called the *Interim*.

III. This revolution seemed every way adapted to compleat the ruin of the protestant cause, and to crown the efforts of the Roman pontif with the most triumphant success. In the diet of *Augsburg*, which was assembled soon after, with an imperial army at hand to promote union and dispatch, the emperor required of the protestants that they would leave the decision of these religious contests to the wisdom of the council that was to meet at *Trent*. The greatest part of the members consented to this proposal; and, among others, MAURICE, the new elector of *Saxony*, who owed both his electorate and his dominions to the emperor, and who was ardently desirous of obtaining the liberty of his father-in-law the landgrave of *Hesse*. This general submission to the will of the emperor, did not, however, produce the fruits that were expected from such a solemn and almost universal approbation of the council of *Trent*. A plague, which manifested itself, or was said to do so, in that city, engaged the greatest part of the assembled fathers to retire to *Bologna*, and thereby the council was, in effect, dissolved; nor could all the entreaties and remonstrances of the emperor prevail upon the pope to re-assemble it again without delay. While things were in this situation, and the prospect of seeing a council assembled was cast at a distance, the emperor judged it necessary, during this *interval*, to fall upon some method of maintaining peace in religious matters, until the decision, so long expected, should be finally obtained. It was with this view, that he ordered JULIUS PFLUGIUS, bishop of *Naumburg*, MICHAEL SIDONIUS, a creature of the pontif, and JOHN AGRICOLA, a native of *Aylleben*, to draw up a *Formulary*, which might serve as a rule of faith and worship to both of the contending parties, until a council should be summoned. As this was only a temporary appointment, and had not the force of a permanent or perpetual institution, the rule in question was called the *Interim* [a].

[(y) There is scarcely in history, any instance of such a mean, perfidious, and despotic behaviour as that of the emperor to the landgrave in the case now before us. After having received in public the humble submissions of that unhappy prince, made upon his knees, and that, in the most respectful and affecting terms, and after having set him at liberty by a solemn treaty, he had him arrested anew without alledging any reason, nay, any pretext, and kept him for several years in a close and severe confinement. When MAURICE remonstrated to the emperor against this new imprisonment, the emperor answered, that he had never promised that the landgrave should not be imprisoned anew, but only, that he should be exempted from perpetual imprisonment; and, to support this assertion, he produced the treaty, in which his ministers, in order to elude the true meaning of the accommodation, had perfidiously foisted in *ewiger gefangnis*, which signifies a perpetual prison, instead of *einiger gefangnis*, which means any prison. This matter is, however, contested by some historians.]

[z] See a German work, entitled, BENI GROSCH *Vertbeidigung der Evangelischen Kirchen gegen Gottfr. Arnold*. p. 29.

[(a) This project of CHARLES was formed, partly to vent his resentment against the pope, and partly to answer other purposes of a more political kind. Be that as it may, the *Formula ad Interim*, or Temporary Rule of Faith and Worship, here mentioned, contained all the essential doctrines of the church of *Rome*, though considerably softened and mitigated by the moderate, prudent, and artful terms in which they were expressed; terms quite different from those that were employed, be-

IV. This

IV. This temporary rule of faith and discipline, though it was extremely favourable to the interests and pretensions of the court of *Rome*, had yet the fate, to which schemes of reconciliation are often exposed; it pleased neither of the contending parties, but was equally offensive to the followers of *LUTHER*, and to the Roman pontif. It was, however, promulgated with solemnity by the emperor at the diet of *Augsburg*, and the elector of *Mentz*, without even deigning to ask the opinions of the assembled princes and states, rose with an air of authority, and, as if he had been commissioned to represent the whole diet, gave a formal and public approbation to this famous *Interim*. Thus were many princes of the empire, whose silence, though it proceeded from want of courage, was interpreted as the mark of a tacit consent, engaged against their will to receive this book, as a body of ecclesiastical law. The greatest part of those, who had the resolution to dispute the authority of this Imperial Creed, were obliged to submit to it by the force of arms; and hence arose deplorable scenes of violence and blood-shed, which involved the empire in the greatest calamities. *MAURICE*, elector of *Saxony*, who, for some time, had held a neutral conduct, and neither declared himself for those who rejected, nor for those who had adopted, the rule in question, assembled, in the year 1548, the Saxon nobility and clergy, with *MELANCTHON* at the head of the latter, and, in several conferences held at *Leipfic* and other places, took counsel concerning what was to be done in this critical affair. The deliberations, on this occasion, were long and tedious, and their result was ambiguous; for *MELANCTHON*, whose opinion was respected as a law by the reformed doctors, fearing the emperor on the one hand, and attentive to the sentiments of his sovereign on the other, pronounced a sort of a reconciling sentence, which, he hoped, would be offensive to no party. He gave it as his opinion, that the whole of the book, called *Interim*, could not, by any means, be adopted by the friends of the reformation; but he declared, at the same time, that he saw no reason, why this book might not be approved, adopted, and received, as an authoritative rule, in things that did not relate to the essential points of religion, in things

CENT. XVI.
The troubles to
which this edict
gave rise.

fore and after this period, by the council of *Trent*. There was even an affected ambiguity in many expressions which rendered them susceptible of different senses, applicable to the sentiments of both communions, and therefore disagreeable to both. The *Interim* was composed with that fraudulent, specious, and seducing dexterity, that in after times appeared in the deceitful *Exposition of the Catholic Faith*, by *M. Bossuet*, bishop of *Meaux*, and it was almost equally rejected by the protestants and Roman catholics. The cup was allowed, by this Imperial Creed, to the protestants in the administration of the Lord's supper, and priests and clerks were permitted, by it, to enter into the married state. These grants were, however, accompanied with the two following conditions: 1. *That every one should be at liberty to use the cup, or to abstain from it, and to choose a state of marriage, or a state of celibacy, as he should judge most fitting.* 2. *That these grants should remain in force no longer than the happy period, when a general council should terminate all religious differences.* This second condition was adapted to produce the greatest disorder and confusion, in case the future council should think proper to enjoin celibacy on the clergy, and declare, as it did in effect, their marriage unchristian and unlawful.]

[a] See *JO. ERDM. BIECKII Triplex Interim*, published in 8^{vo} at *Leipfic* in the year 1721.—*LUC. OSIANDER Centuria XVI. Histor. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. lxviii. p. 425.*—For an account of the authors and editions of the book, called *Interim*, see *Die Dänische Bibliothek*, part. V. p. 1. & part. VI. p. 185.

that

CENT. XVI.

The project of a
council at Trent
renewed.

that might be considered as accessory or indifferent [b]. This decision, instead of pacifying matters, produced, on the contrary, new divisions, and formed a schism among the followers of LUTHER, of which farther mention shall be made hereafter, in the *History of the Church*, established by that reformer. I shall only observe, that this schism placed the cause of the reformation in the most perilous and critical circumstances, and might have contributed either to ruin it entirely, or to retard considerably its progress, had the pope and the emperor been dexterous enough to make the proper use of these divisions, and to seize the favourable occasion that was presented to them of turning the force of the protestants against themselves.

V. Amidst these contests PAUL III. departed this life in the year 1549, and was succeeded, the year following, by JULIUS III., who, yielding to the repeated and importunate solicitations of the emperor, consented to the assembling a council at *Trent*. Accordingly, in the diet of *Augsburg*, which was again held under the cannon of an Imperial army, CHARLES laid this matter before the states and princes of the empire. The greatest part of the princes gave their consent to the convocation of this council, to which also MAURICE, elector of *Saxony*, submitted upon certain conditions [c]. The emperor then concluded the diet in the year 1551, desiring the assembled princes and states to prepare all things for the approaching council, and promising that he would use his most zealous endeavours towards the promoting moderation and harmony, impartiality and charity in the deliberations and transactions of that assembly. Upon the breaking up of the diet, the protestants took the steps they judged most prudent to prepare themselves for what was to happen. The Saxons employed the pen of MELANCTHON, and the Wurttembergers that of BRENTIUS, to draw up *confessions* of their faith, that were to be laid before the new council. Besides the ambassadors of the duke of *Wurtemberg*, several doctors of that city repaired to *Trent*. The Saxon divines, with MELANCTHON at their head, set out also for that place, but proceeded in their journey no farther than *Nuremberg*. They had received secret orders to stop there; for MAURICE had no intention of submitting to the emperor's views; on the contrary, he hoped to reduce that prince to a compliance with his own projects. He therefore yielded in appearance, that he might carry his point, and thus command in reality.

[(b) By things *indifferent* MELANCTHON understood particularly the rites and ceremonies of the popish worship, which, superstitious as they were, that reformer, yielding to the softness and flexibility of his natural temper, treated with a singular and excessive indulgence upon this occasion.]

[(c) MAURICE (who was desirous of regaining the esteem of the protestants of *Saxony*, which he had lost by his perfidious behaviour to the late elector JOHN FREDERICK, his benefactor and friend) gave his consent to the re-establishing the council of *Trent* upon the following conditions: 1st, That the points of doctrine, which had been already decided there, should be re-examined, and discussed anew: 2^{dly}, That this examination should be made in presence of the protestant divines, or their deputies. 3^{dly}, That the Saxon protestants should have a liberty of *voting*, as well as of *deliberating*, in the council: and 4^{thly}, That the pope should not pretend to preside in that assembly, either in person, or by his legates. This declaration of MAURICE was read in the diet, and his deputies insisted upon its being entered into the registers, which the archbishop of *Mentz*, however, obstinately refused.]

VI. The

VI. The real views of CHARLES V, amidst the divisions and troubles of *Germany* (which he fomented by negotiations that carried the outward aspect of a reconciling spirit) will appear evidently to such as consider attentively the nature of the times, and compare the transactions of this prince, the one with the other. Relying on the extent of his power and the success that frequently accompanied his enterprizes, with a degree of confidence that was highly imprudent, CHARLES proposed to turn these religious commotions and dissensions to the confirmation and increase of his dominion in *Germany*, and by sowing the seeds of discord among the princes of the empire to weaken their power, and thereby the more easily to encroach upon their rights and privileges. On the other hand, ardently desirous of reducing within narrower limits the jurisdiction and dominion of the Roman pontiffs, that they might not set bounds to his ambition, nor prevent the execution of his aspiring views, he flattered himself that this would be the natural effect of the approaching council. He was confirmed in this pleasing hope by reflecting on what had happened in the councils of *Constance* and of *Basil*, in which the lust of papal ambition had been opposed with spirit, and restrained within certain limits. He also persuaded himself, that, by the dexterity of his agents, and the number of the Spanish and German bishops that were devoted to his interests, he should be able to influence and direct the deliberations of the approaching council in such a manner, as to make its decisions answer his expectations, and contribute effectually to the accomplishment of his views. Such were the specious dreams of ambition that filled the imagination of this restless prince; but his views and projects were disconcerted by that same MAURICE of *Saxony*, who had been one of the principal instruments of that violence and oppression which he had exercised against the protestant princes, and of the injury he had done to the protestant cause.

Cent. XVI.
Maurice disconcerts the schemes of the emperor.

VII. The most considerable princes, not only of *Germany*, but even of all *Europe*, had, for a long time, addressed to the emperor their united entreaties for the deliverance of PHILIP, landgrave of *Hesse* and JOHN FREDERICK, elector of *Saxony*, from their confinement; and MAURICE had solicited, with peculiar warmth and assiduity, the liberty of the former, who was his father-in-law. But all these solicitations produced no effect. MAURICE, perceiving at length that he was duped by the emperor, and also convinced that this ambitious monarch was forming insidious designs upon the liberties of *Germany* and the jurisdiction of its princes, entered, with the utmost secrecy and expedition, into an alliance with the king of *France* and several of the German princes for the maintenance of the rights and liberties of the empire. Encouraged by this respectable confederacy, the active Saxon marched a powerful army against the emperor, in the year 1552; and that with such astonishing valour and rapidity, that he surprized CHARLES at *Inspruk*, where he lay with a handful of troops in the utmost security, and without the least apprehension of danger. This sudden and unforeseen event alarmed and dejected the emperor to such a degree, that he was willing to make peace on, almost, any conditions; and consequently,

A war kindled between the emperor and Maurice of *Saxony*.

CENT. XVI. quently, in a little time after this, he not only concluded at *Passau* the famous treaty of *Pacification* with the protestants [d]; but also promised to assemble, in the space of six months, a diet, in which all the tumults and dissensions, that had been occasioned by a variety of sentiments in religious matters, should be entirely removed. Thus did the same prince, who stands foremost in the list of those that oppressed the protestants and reduced their affairs to the greatest extremities, restore their expiring hopes, support and render triumphant their desperate cause, and procure them a bulwark of peace and liberty, which still remains. MAURICE, however, did not live to see this happy issue of his glorious expedition; for he lost his life the year following, by a wound received at the battle of *Sieverhausen*, while he was fighting against ALBERT of *Brandenburg* [e].

The diet of
Augsburg, and
the peace of re-
ligion.

VIII. The troubles of *Germany*, with several other incidents, rendered it impossible to assemble the Diet, which the emperor had promised at the pacification of *Passau*, so soon as the period mentioned in the articles of that treaty. This famous diet met, however, at *Augsburg* in the year 1555, was opened by FERDINAND in the name of the emperor, and terminated those deplorable scenes of blood-shed, desolation, and discord that had so long afflicted both church and state, by that religious peace, as it is commonly called, which secured to the protestants the free exercise of their religion, and established this inestimable liberty upon the firmest foundations. For after various debates the following memorable acts were passed on the 25th of September: that the protestants, who followed the confession of *Augsburg*, should be for the future considered, as entirely exempt from the jurisdiction of the Roman pontif, and from the authority and superintendence of the bishops; that they were left at perfect liberty to enact laws for themselves relating to their religious sentiments, discipline, and worship; that all the inhabitants of the German empire should be allowed to judge for themselves in religious matters, and to join themselves to that church whose doctrine and worship they thought the purest and the most consonant to the spirit of true Christianity; and that all those who should injure or persecute any

[(d) As this treaty is considered by the German protestants as the basis of their religious liberty, it will not be amiss to insert here some of its principal articles. By the three first articles it was stipulated, that MAURICE and the confederates should lay down their arms, and should lend their troops to FERDINAND to defend him against the Turks, and that the landgrave of *Hesse* should be set at liberty. By the fourth it was agreed, that the rule of faith, called *Interim*, should be considered as null and void; that the contending parties should enjoy the free and undisturbed exercise of their religion, until a diet should be assembled to determine amicably the present disputes (which diet was to meet in the space of six months); and that this religious liberty should continue always, in case that it should be found impossible to come to an uniformity in doctrine and worship. It was also resolved, that all those who had suffered banishment, or any other calamity on account of their having been concerned in the league or war of *Smalcald*, should be re-instated in their privileges, their possessions, and employments; that the Imperial chamber at *Spire* should be open to the protestants as well as to the catholics; and, that there should be always a certain number of the Lutheran persuasion in that high court.]

[(e) ALBERT, marquis of *Brandenburg*, after the pacification of *Passau*, to which he refused to subscribe, continued the war against the Roman catholics, and afterwards committed such ravages in the empire, that a confederacy was formed against him, at the head of which MAURICE was placed.]

person

person under religious pretexts, and on account of their opinions, should be CENT. XVI.
declared, and proceeded against, as public enemies of the empire, invaders
of its liberty, and disturbers of its peace [f]. The difficulties that were to
be surmounted, before this equitable decision could be procured, the tedious
deliberations, the warm debates, the violent animosities and bloody wars
that were necessary to engage the greatest part of the German states to con-
sent to conditions so agreeable to the dictates of right reason, as well as to
the sacred injunctions of the gospel, shew us, in a shocking and glaring
point of light, the ignorance and superstition of these miserable times, and
stand upon record as one of the most evident proofs of the necessity of the
reformation.

[IX.] While these things were transacting in Germany, the friends of The reformation
gains ground in
England.
genuine Christianity in *England* deplored the gloomy reign of superstition,
and the almost total extinction of true religion; and, seeing before their eyes
the cause of popery maintained by the terrors of bloody persecution, and
daily victims brought to the stake to expiate the pretended crime of pre-
ferring the dictates of the Gospel to the despotic laws of *Rome*, they esteemed
the Germans happy, in having thrown off the yoke of an imperious and
superstitious church. HENRY VIII, whose personal vices, as well as his
arbitrary and capricious conduct, had greatly retarded the progress of the
reformation, was now no more. He departed this life, in the year 1547,
and was succeeded by his only son EDWARD VI. This amiable prince,
whose early youth was crowned with that wisdom, sagacity, and virtue, that
would have done honour to advanced years, gave new spirit and vigour to the
protestant cause, and was its brightest ornament, as well as its most effec-
tual support. He encouraged learned and pious men of foreign countries
to settle in *England*, and addressed a particular invitation to MARTIN BUCER
and PAUL FAGIUS, whose moderation added a lustre to their other virtues,
that, by the ministry and labours of these eminent men in concert with those
of the friends of the reformation in *England*, he might purge his dominions
from the sordid fictions of popery, and establish the pure doctrines of Christi-
anity in their place. For this purpose he issued out the wisest orders for the
restoration of true religion; but his reign was too short to accomplish fully
such a glorious purpose. In the year 1553, he was taken from his loving
and afflicted subjects, whose sorrow was inexpressible and suited to their
loss. His sister MARY (the daughter of CATHARINE of *Aragon* from whom
HENRY had been separated by the famous divorce) a furious bigot to the
church of *Rome*, and a princess whose natural character, like the spirit of her
religion, was despotic and cruel, succeeded him on the British throne, and
imposed anew the arbitrary laws and the tyrannical yoke of *Rome* upon the
people of *England*. Nor were the methods she employed, in the cause of
superstition, better than the cause itself, or tempered by any sentiments of
equity or compassion. Barbarous tortures and death, in the most shocking
forms, awaited those who opposed her will, or made the least stand against

[f] See JO. SCHILTERI *Liber de Pace Religiosa*, published in 4^{to} in the year 1700. — CURT.
BEHMANNI *Acta publica et originalia de Pace Religiosa*. Francof. 1707.

CEN T. XVI. the restoration of popery. And among many other victims, the learned and pious CRANMER, archbishop of *Canterbury*, who had been one of the most illustrious instruments of the reformation in *England*, fell a sacrifice to her fury. This odious scene of persecution was happily concluded, in the year 1558, by the death of the queen, who left no issue; and, as soon as her successor the lady ELIZABETH ascended the throne, all things assumed a new and a pleasing aspect. This illustrious princess, whose sentiments, counsels, and projects breathed a spirit superior to the natural softness and delicacy of her sex, exerted this vigorous and manly spirit, in the defence of oppressed conscience and expiring liberty, broke anew the despotic yoke of papal authority and superstition, and, delivering her people from the bondage of *Rome*, established that form of religious doctrine and ecclesiastical government which still subsists in *England*. This religious establishment differs, in some respects, from the plan that had been formed by those whom EDWARD VI had employed for promoting the cause of the reformation, and approaches nearer to the rites and discipline of former times; though it is widely different, and, in the most important points, entirely opposite to the principles of the Roman hierarchy.

In *Scotland*.

X. The seeds of the reformation were very early sown in *Scotland*, by several noblemen of that nation who had resided in *Germany*, during the religious disputes that divided the empire. But the power of the Roman pontif, supported and seconded by inhuman laws and barbarous executions, choked, for many years, these tender seeds, and prevented their taking root. The first and most eminent opposer of the papal jurisdiction was JOHN KNOX [g], a disciple of CALVIN, whose eloquence was persuasive, and whose fortitude was invincible [b]. This resolute reformer set out from *Geneva* for *Scotland* in the year 1559, and, in a very short space of time, inspired the people, by

[g] It will not be improper to insert here the character of this famous Scottish reformer, as it is drawn by the elegant, spirited, accurate, and impartial pen of Dr. ROBERTSON, in his *History of Scotland*, book VI. "Zeal, intrepidity, disinterestedness (says that incomparable writer) were virtues which he possessed in an eminent degree. He was acquainted, too, with the learning cultivated in that age; and excelled in that species of eloquence which is calculated to rouse and to inflame. His maxims, however, were often too severe, and the impetuosity of his temper excessive. Rigid and uncomplying himself, he shewed no indulgence to the infirmities of others. Regardless of the distinctions of rank and character, he uttered his admonitions with an acrimony and vehemence, more apt to irritate than to reclaim. This often betrayed him into indecent and undutiful expressions with respect to the queen's person and conduct. Those very qualities, however, which now rendered his character less amiable, fitted him to be the instrument of providence for advancing the reformation, among a fierce people, and enabled him to face dangers and to surmount opposition, from which a person of a more gentle spirit would have been apt to shrink back. By an unwearied application to study and to business, as well as by the frequency and fervour of his public discourses, he had worn out a constitution naturally strong. During a lingering illness he discovered the utmost fortitude, and met the approaches of death with a magnanimity inseparable from his character. He was constantly employed in acts of devotion, and comforted himself with those prospects of immortality, which not only preserve good men from desponding, but fill them with exultation in their last moments.]

[b] The earl of Morton, who was present at his funeral, pronounced his eulogium in a few words, the more honourable for KNOX, as they came from one, whom he had often censured with peculiar severity: *There lies He, who never feared the face of man.*

his

his private exhortations and his public discourses, with such a violent aversion to the superstitions of *Rome*, that the greatest part of the Scotch nation abandoned them entirely, and aimed at nothing less than the total extirpation of popery [i]. From this period to the present times the form of doctrine, worship, and discipline, that had been established at *Geneva* by the ministry of CALVIN, has been maintained in *Scotland* with invincible obstinacy and zeal, and every attempt to introduce, into that kingdom, the rites and government of the church of *England*, has proved impotent and unsuccessful [k].

XI. The cause of the reformation underwent, in *Ireland*, the same vicissitudes and revolutions, that had attended it in *England*. When HENRY VIII, after the abolition of the papal authority, was declared *supreme head, upon earth, of the church of England*, GEORGE BROWN, a native of *England*, and a monk of the Augustin order, whom that monarch had created, in the year

In *Ireland*.

[i] See NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 165. 232. 234. 569.—CALDERWOOD's *History of Scotland's Reformation*, published in folio at London in the year 1680.—GEORGE BUCHANAN *Rerum Scotticar. Hist.* lib. xvi. p. 313. edit. Rudimann. folio.—MELVIL's *Memoirs*, vol. i. p. 73.

[k] The indignation of the people, which had been excited by the vices of the clergy, was soon transferred to their persons, and settled at last, by a transition not unusual, upon the offices they enjoyed; and thus the effects of the reformation extended, not only to the doctrine, but also to the government of the popish church. But in *Germany*, *England*, and the northern kingdoms its operations were checked by the power and policy of their princes, and the episcopal hierarchy (which appears to be the most conformable to the practice of the church, since Christianity became the established religion of the Roman empire) was still continued, in these countries, under certain limitations. The ecclesiastical government was copied after the civil; and the dioceses, and jurisdiction of patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops corresponded with the division and constitution of the empire. In *Switzerland* and the *Low-Countries* the nature and spirit of a republican policy gave fuller scope to the reformers, and thus all pre-eminence of order in the church was destroyed, and that form of ecclesiastical government established, which has been since called *Presbyterian*. The situation of the primitive church (oppressed by continual persecutions, and obliged by their sufferings to be contented with a form of government extremely simple, and with a parity of rank for want of ambition to propose, or power to support, a subordination) suggested, without doubt, the idea of this latter system; though it would be unfair to alledge this consideration, as a victorious argument in favour of *Presbyterianism*; because a change of circumstances will sometimes justify a change in the methods and plans of government. Be that as it may, the church of *Geneva*, which received the decisions of CALVIN with an amazing docility, restored this *Presbyterian*, or republican form of ecclesiastical policy; KNOX studied, admired, and recommended it to his countrymen, and he was seconded by many of the Scotch nobles, of whom some hated the persons, while others coveted the wealth of the dignified clergy. But, in introducing this system, the Scotch reformer did not deem it expedient to depart altogether from the ancient form, but instead of *bishops*, proposed the establishment of ten *superintendants* to inspect the life and doctrine of the other clergy, to preside in the inferior judicatories of the church, without pretending to claim either a seat in parliament, or the revenues and dignity of the former bishops. This proposal was drawn up and presented to a convention of estates, which was held in the year 1561, and what it contained in relation to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and discipline, would have easily obtained the sanction of that assembly, had not a design to recover the patrimony of the church, in order to apply it to the advancement of religion and learning, been insinuated in it. After this, at certain periods, the name of bishops was revived, but without the prerogatives, jurisdiction, or revenues, that were formerly appropriated to that order. They were made subject to the general assemblies of the clergy, and their power was diminished from day to day, until their name, as well as their order, was abolished, at the revolution in 1688, and *Presbyterianism* established in *Scotland* by the laws of the state. See ROBERTSON's *History of Scotland*, passim.]

CENT. XVI. 1535, archbishop of *Dublin*, began to act with the utmost vigour in consequence of this change in the hierarchy. He purged the churches of his diocese from superstition in all its various forms, pulled down images, destroyed relics, abolished absurd and idolatrous rites, and, by the influence, as well as authority he had in *Ireland*, caused the king's supremacy to be acknowledged in that nation [W]. HENRY shewed soon after, that this supremacy was not a vain title; for he banished the monks out of that kingdom, confiscated their revenues, and destroyed their convents. In the reign of EDWARD VI still farther progress was made in the removal of popish superstitions, by the zealous labours of bishop BROWN, and the auspicious encouragement he granted to all who exerted themselves in the cause of the reformation. But the death of this excellent prince, and the accession of his sister to the throne, changed the face of things in *Ireland*, as it had done in *England* [m]. MARY pursued with fire and sword, and all the marks of

[(l) The learned and pious primate USHER, in his Memoirs of the ecclesiastical affairs of *Ireland*, speaks of bishop BROWN in the following manner: "GEORGE BROWN was a man of a cheerful countenance, in his acts and deeds plain downright, to the poor merciful and compassionate, pitying the state and condition of the souls of the people, and advising them, when he was provincial of the Augustine order in *England*, to make their application solely to Christ; which advice coming to the ears of HENRY VIII, he became a favorite, and was made archbishop of *Dublin*. Within five years after he enjoyed that see, he caused all superstitious relics and images to be removed out of the two cathedrals in *Dublin*, and out of all the churches in his diocese, and caused the *Ten commandments*, the *Lord's Prayer*, and the *Creed* to be placed in gilded frames about the altars. He was the first that turned from the Romish religion of the clergy here in *Ireland*, to embrace the reformation of the church of *England*." See a very curious pamphlet in the fifth volume of the *Harleian Miscellany*, p. 558. entitled, *Historical Collections, of the Church of Ireland, &c.*]

[(m) Here Dr. MOSHEIM has fallen into a mistake by not distinguishing between the designs of the queen which were, indeed, cruel, and their execution, which was happily and providentially prevented. This appears from a very singular and comical adventure, of which the account, as it has been copied from the papers of Richard, earl of Cork, and is to be found among the manuscripts of Sir James Ware, is as follows:

"Queen Mary having dealt severely with the protestants in *England*, about the latter end of her reign signed a commission for to take the same course with them in *Ireland*; and, to execute the same with greater force, she nominates Dr. Cole, one of the commissioners. This doctor coming, with the commission, to *Chester* on his journey, the mayor of that city hearing that her majesty was sending a messenger into *Ireland*, and he being a churchman, waited on the doctor, who, in discourse with the mayor, taketh out of a cloke bag a leather box, saying unto him, "Here is a commission that shall lash the heretics of *Ireland*," (calling the protestants by that title.) "The good woman of the house, being well affected to the protestant religion, and also having a brother named John Edmonds of the same, then a citizen in *Dublin*, was much troubled at the doctor's words; but watching her convenient time while the mayor took his leave, and the doctor complimented him down the stairs, she opens the box, takes the commission out, and places in lieu thereof a sheet of paper, with a pack of cards wrapt up therein, the knave of clubs being faced uppermost. The doctor coming up to his chamber, suspecting nothing of what had been done, put up the box, as formerly. The next day going to the water-side, wind and weather serving him, he sails towards *Ireland*, and landed, on the 7th of October 1558, at *Dublin*. Then coming to the castle, the lord Fitz-Walters, being lord-deputy, sent for him to come before him and the privy council; who, coming in, after he had made a speech relating upon what account he came over, he presents the box unto the lord-deputy, who, causing it to be opened, that the secretary might read the commission, there was nothing save a pack of cards with the knave of clubs uppermost; which not only startled the lord-deputy and council, but the doctor, who assured them he had a commission, but knew not how it was gone; then the lord-deputy made answer: Let us have another commission, and we will shuffle the cards in the mean while.

unrelenting

unrelenting vengeance, the promoters of a pure and rational religion, and deprived BROWN and other protestant bishops of their dignities in the church. But the reign of ELIZABETH gave a new and a deadly blow to popery, which was again recovering its force, and arming itself anew with the authority of the throne; and the Irish were obliged again to submit to the form of worship and discipline established in England [n].

XII. The reformation had not been long established in Britain, when the Belgic provinces, united by a respectable confederacy which still subsists, withdrew from their spiritual allegiance to the Roman pontif. PHILIP II, king of Spain, apprehending the danger to which the religion of Rome was exposed from that spirit of liberty and independence which reigned in the inhabitants of the Low-Countries, took the most violent measures to dispel it. For this purpose he augmented the number of the bishops, enacted the most severe and barbarous laws against all innovators in matters of religion, and erected that unjust and inhuman tribunal of the *inquisition*, which would intimidate and tame, as he thought, the manly spirit of an oppressed and persecuted people. But his measures, in this respect, were as unsuccessful, as they were absurd; his furious and intemperate zeal for the superstitions of Rome accelerated their destruction, and the papal authority, which had only been in a critical state, was reduced to a desperate one by the very steps that were designed to support it. The nobility formed themselves into an *association* in the year 1566, with a view to procure the repeal of these tyrannical and barbarous edicts; but, their solicitations and requests being treated with contempt, they resolved to obtain by force, what they hoped to have gained from clemency and justice. They addressed themselves to a free and an abused people, revolted against the authority of a cruel yoke, and with an impetuosity and vehemence, that were perhaps excessive, trampled upon whatever was held sacred or respectable by the church of Rome [a].

The reformation takes place in the united provinces.

"The doctor, being troubled in his mind, went away, and returned into England; and, coming to the court, obtained another commission; but, staying for a wind on the water-side, news came to him, that the queen was dead, and thus God preserved the protestants of Ireland."

Queen ELIZABETH was so delighted with this story, which was related to her by lord Fitz-Walter on his return to England, that she sent for Elizabeth Edmonds, whose husband's name was Matterbad, and gave her a pension of forty pounds during her life. See Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana, or History of Ireland*, &c. vol. ii. p. 308.—*Harleian Miscellany*, vol. v. p. 568.]

[n] See *The Life of Dr. George Brown, Archbishop of Dublin*, published at London in 4^{to} in the year 1681, and which has been reprinted in the fifth volume of the *Harleian Miscellany*, N^o LXXX.

[(o) Dr. MOSHEIM seems here to distinguish, too little, between the spirit of the nobility and that of the multitude. Nothing was more *temperate* and *discreet* than the conduct of the former; and nothing could be more *tumultuous* and *irregular* than the behaviour of the latter. While the multitude destroyed churches, pulled down monasteries, broke the images used in public worship, abused the officers of the inquisition, and committed a thousand enormities, the effects of furious resentment and brutish rage; the nobility and more opulent citizens kept within the bounds of moderation and prudence. Though justly exasperated against a despotic and cruel government, they dreaded the consequences of popular tumults as the greatest of misfortunes. Nay, many of them united their counsels and forces with those of the governors (the dukes of Parma) to restrain the seditious and turbulent spirit of the people. The prince of Orange and count Egmont (whose memories will live for ever in the grateful remembrance of the Dutch nation, and be dear to all the lovers of heroic patriotism and sacred liberty throughout the world) signified their moderation upon this occasion, and were the chief instruments of the repose that ensued. Their opposition to

To,

CENT. XVI. To quell these tumults a powerful army was sent from *Spain*, under the command of the duke of ALVA, whose horrid barbarity and sanguinary proceedings kindled that long and bloody war from which the powerful republic of the United provinces derived its origin, consistence, and grandeur. It was the heroic conduct of WILLIAM of *Nassau*, prince of *Orange*, seconded by the succours of *England* and *France*, that delivered this state from the Spanish yoke. And no sooner was this deliverance obtained, than the reformed religion, as it was professed in *Switzerland*, was established in the united provinces [p]; and, at the same time, an universal toleration granted to those whose religious sentiments were of a different nature, whether they retained the faith of *Rome*, or embraced the reformation in another form [q], provided still that they made no attempts against the authority of the government, or the tranquillity of the public [r].

The progress of
the reformation
in *Spain* and
Italy.

XIII. The reformation made a considerable progress in *Spain* and *Italy* soon after the rupture between LUTHER and the Roman pontif. In all the provinces of *Italy*, but more especially in the territories of *Venice*, *Tuscany*, and *Naples*, the religion of *Rome* lost ground, and great numbers of persons, of all ranks and orders, expressed an aversion to the papal yoke. This gave rise to violent and dangerous commotions in the kingdom of *Naples* in the year 1546, of which the principal authors were BERNARD OCHINO and PETER MARTYR, who, in their public discourses from the pulpit, exhausted all the force of their irresistible eloquence in exposing the enormity of the reigning superstition. These tumults were appeased with much difficulty by the united efforts of CHARLES V, and his viceroy DON PEDRO DI TOLEDO [s]. In several places the popes put a stop to the progress of the reformation by letting loose, upon the pretended heretics, their bloody inquisitors, who spread the marks of their usual barbarity through the greatest part of *Italy*. These formidable ministers of superstition put so many to death, and perpetrated, on the friends of religious liberty, such horrid acts of cruelty and oppression, that most of the reformists consulted their safety by a voluntary exile, while others returned to the religion of *Rome*, at least

the government proceeded from the dictates of humanity and justice, and not from a spirit of licentiousness and rebellion; and such was their influence and authority among the people, that, had the imperious court of *Spain* condescended to make any reasonable concessions, the public tranquillity might have been again restored, and the affections of the people entirely regained. See LE CLERC, *Histoire des Prouv. Un.* livr. i. p. 18.]

[p] In the year 1573.

[q] It is necessary to distinguish between the toleration that was granted to the Roman catholics, and that which the *Anabaptists*, *Lutherans*, and other protestant sects enjoyed. They were all indiscriminately excluded from the civil employments of the state; but though they were equally allowed the exercise of their religion, the latter were permitted to enjoy their religious worship in a more open and public manner than the former, from whom the churches were taken, and whose religious assemblies were confined to private conventicles, which had no external resemblance of the edifices usually set apart for divine worship.]

[r] See a farther account of this matter in GERARD BRANDT'S *History of the Reformation in the Netherlands*, of which there was a French abridgment published at *Amsterdam*, in three volumes 12°. in the year 1730. The original work was published in Dutch, in four volumes 4°.

[s] See GIANNONE *Histoire Civile du Royaume de Naples*, tom. iv. p. 108.—VITA GALEACII in *Museo Helvetico*, tom. ii. p. 524.

in external appearance. But the terrors of the *inquisition*, which frightened back into the profession of popery several protestants in other parts of *Italy*, could not penetrate into the kingdom of *Naples*, nor could either the authority or entreaties of the Roman pontiffs engage the Neapolitans to admit within their territories either a court of *inquisition*, or even visiting inquisitors [†].

The eyes of several persons in *Spain* were opened upon the truth, not only by the spirit of inquiry, which the controversies between *LUTHER* and *Rome* had excited in *Europe*, but even by those very divines, which *CHARLES V* had brought with him into *Germany*, to combat the pretended *heresy* of the reformers. For these Spanish doctors imbibed this heresy instead of refuting it, and propagated it more or less, on their return home, as appears evidently from several circumstances [u]. But the *inquisition*, which could not gain any footing in the kingdom of *Naples*, reigned triumphant in *Spain*; and by racks, gibbets, stakes, and other such formidable instruments of its method of persuading, soon terrified the people back into popery, and sup-

[†] It was an attempt to introduce a Roman inquisitor into the city of *Naples*, that, properly speaking, produced the tumult and sedition which *Dr. Mosheim* attributes in this section to the pulpit discourses of *Ochino* and *Martini*; for these famous preachers, and particularly the former, taught the doctrines of the reformation with great art, prudence, and caution, and converted many secretly without giving public offence. The emperor himself, who heard him at *Naples*, declared, that he preached with such spirit and devotion as was sufficient to make the very stones weep. After *Ochino's* departure from *Naples*, the disciples he had formed gave private instructions to others, among whom were some eminent ecclesiastics, and persons of distinction, who began to form congregations and conventicles. This awakened the jealousy of the viceroy *Toledo*, who published a severe edict against heretical books, ordered some productions of *MELANCTHON* and *ERASMUS* to be publicly burnt, looked with a suspicious eye on all kinds of literature, suppressed several academies, which had been erected about this time, by the nobility for the advancement of learning, and, having received orders from the emperor to introduce the *inquisition*, desired pope *PAUL III* to send from *Rome* to *Naples* a deputy of that formidable tribunal. It was this, that excited the people to take up arms in order to defend themselves against this branch of spiritual tyranny, which the Neapolitans never were patient enough to suffer, and which, on many occasions, they had opposed with vigour and success. Hostilities ensued, which were followed by an accommodation of matters and a general pardon; while the emperor and viceroy, by this resolute opposition, were deterred from their design of introducing this despotic tribunal into the kingdom of *Naples*. Several other attempts were afterwards made, during the reigns of *PHILIP II*, *III*, *IV*, and *CHARLES II*; to establish the *inquisition* in *Naples*; but, by the jealousy and vigilance of the people, they all proved ineffectual. At length the emperor *CHARLES VI*, in the beginning of this present century, published an edict, expressly prohibiting all causes, relating to the holy faith, to be tried by any persons, except the archbishops and bishops as ordinaries. See *GIANNONE Histoire de Naples*, livr. xxxii. sect. 2. and 3. — *Modern Univ. History*, vol. xxviii. p. 273, &c. edit. octavo.]

[u] This appears from the unhappy end of all the ecclesiastics that had attended *CHARLES V*, and followed him into his retirement. No sooner was the breath of that monarch out, than they were put into the *inquisition*, and were afterwards committed to the flames, or sent to death in other forms equally terrible. Such was the fate of *AUGUSTIN CASAL*, the emperor's preacher; of *CONSTANTINE PONTIUS*, his confessor; of the learned *EGIDIUS*, whom he had named to the bishoprick of *Tortosa*; of *BARTHOLOMEW DE CARANZA*, a Dominican, who had been confessor to king *PHILIP* and queen *MARY*, with above twenty more of less note. All this gave reason to presume that *CHARLES V* died a protestant. Certain it is, that he knew well the corruptions and frauds of the church of *Rome*, and the grounds and reasons of the protestant faith; though business, ambition, interest, and the prejudices of education may have blinded him for a while, until leisure, retirement, the absence of worldly temptations, and the approach of death removed the

CENT. XVI.

What judgment
we are to form
concerning the
reformation and
the means by
which it was
produced?

pressed the vehement desire they had of changing a superstitious worship for a rational religion [w].

XIV. I shall not pretend to dispute with those writers, whatever their secret intentions may be, who observe, that many unjustifiable proceedings may be charged upon some of the most eminent promoters of this great change in the state of religion. For every impartial and attentive observer of the rise and progress of the reformation will ingenuously acknowledge, that wisdom and prudence did not always attend the transactions of those, that were concerned in this glorious cause; that many things were done with violence, temerity, and precipitation; and, what is still worse, that several of the principal agents in this great revolution were actuated more by the impulse of passions and views of interest, than by a zeal for the advancement of true religion. But, on the other hand, the wise and candid observer of things will own, as a most evident and incontestable truth, that many things, which, when stripped of the circumstances and motives that attended them, appear to us at this time as real crimes, will be deprived of their enormity and even acquire the aspect of noble deeds, if they be considered in one point of view with the times and places in which they were transacted, and with the frauds and crimes of the Roman pontiffs and their creatures, by which they were occasioned. But after all, in defending the cause of the reformation, we are under no obligation to defend, in all things, the moral characters of its promoters and instruments. These two objects are entirely distinct. The most just and excellent cause may be promoted with low views and from sinister motives, without losing its nature, or ceasing to be just and excellent. The true state of the question here, is, whether the opposition made, by LUTHER and the other reformers, to the Roman pontiff, was founded on just and solid reasons? and this question is entirely independent of the virtues or vices of particular persons [x]. Let many of these persons be supposed as odious, nay, still more detestable, than they are pleased to represent them, provided the cause in which they were embarked be allowed to have been just and good [y].

veil; and led him to wise and serious reflexions. See BURNET's *History of the Reformation*, and the book cited in the following note.]

[w] See GEDDES, his *Spanish Martyrology*, in his *Miscellaneous Tracts*, tom. I. p. 445.

[x] The translator has added here some paragraphs to render more palpable the important observation of the learned author.]

[y] See *A Dissertation concerning the Spirit and Genius, the Causes and Instruments of the Reformation*, composed by the translator of this History, and prefixed to this volume.]

SECTION

...the loss they had sustained in Europe, and the most precious pretext for ...
...the loss they had sustained in Europe, and the most precious pretext for ...
...the loss they had sustained in Europe, and the most precious pretext for ...

SECTION II.

The GENERAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

I. **T**HE Spaniards and Portuguese, if we may give credit to their historians, exerted themselves, with the greatest vigour and success, in the propagation of the Gospel among the darkened nations [a]. And it must, indeed, be confessed, that they communicated some notions, such as they were, of the Christian religion to the inhabitants of *America*, to those parts of *Africa* where they carried their arms, and to the islands and maritime provinces of *Asia*, which they reduced under their dominion. It is also true, that considerable numbers of these savage people, who had, hitherto, lived, either under the bondage of the most extravagant superstitions, or, in a total ignorance of any object of religious worship, embraced, at least in outward appearance, the doctrines of the gospel. But when we consider the methods of conversion that were employed by the Spanish missionaries among these wretched nations, the barbarous laws and inhuman tortures that were used to force them into the profession of Christianity; when it is considered, farther, that the denomination of Christians was conferred upon such of those poor wretches, as discovered a blind and excessive veneration for their stupid instructors, and were able, by certain gestures and the repetition of a little jargon, to perform a few superstitious rites and ceremonies, then, instead of rejoicing at, we shall be tempted to lament such a propagation of the gospel, and to behold the labours of such miserable apostles with indignation and contempt. Such is the judgment passed upon these missionaries, not only by those whom the church of *Rome* places in the list of *heretics*, but also by many of the most pious and eminent of her own doctors in *France*, *Germany*, *Spain*, and *Italy*.

CENT. XVI.

The borders of the church enlarged.

II. When the Roman pontiffs saw their ambition checked by the progress of the reformation, which deprived them of a great part of their spiritual dominion in *Europe*, they turned their lordly views towards the other parts of the globe, and became more solicitous, than ever, about the propagation of the gospel among the nations that lay yet involved in the darkness of

The zeal of the Roman pontiffs in the propagation of Christianity.

[a] See Jos. FRANC. LAETITAY *Histoire des Decouvertes et Conquetes des Portugais dans le nouveau Monde*, tom. iii. p. 470. All the relations, given by this eloquent writer, (who was afterwards created bishop of *Sisteron*) are taken from the Portuguese historians.—The other writers, who have cast light upon this part of Ecclesiastical History, are enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Salutaris. Evangelii toto orbe exorients*, cap. 42, 43, 48 and 49.

CENT. XVI. paganism. This they considered as the best method of making amends for the loss they had sustained in *Europe*, and the most specious pretext for assuming to themselves, with some appearance of justice, the title of heads or parents of the universal church. The famous society, which, in the year 1540, took the denomination of *jesuits*, or, *the company of Jesus*, seemed, every way proper, to assist the court of *Rome* in the execution of this extensive design. And accordingly, from their first rise, this peculiar charge was given them, that they should form a certain number of their order for the propagation of Christianity among the unenlightened nations, and that these missionaries should be at the absolute disposal of the Roman pontif, and always ready, at a moment's warning, to repair to whatever part of the world he should fix for the exercise of their ministry [b]. The many histories and relations, which mention the labours, perils, and exploits of that prodigious multitude of *jesuits*, who were employed in the conversion of the African, American, and Indian infidels, abundantly shew, with what fidelity and zeal the members of this society executed the orders of the Roman pontifs [c]. And their labours would have undoubtedly crowned them with immortal glory, had it not appeared evident, from the most authentic records, that the greatest part of these new apostles had more in view the promoting the ambitious views of *Rome*, and the advancing the interests of their own society, than the propagation of the Christian religion, or the honour of its divine author [d]. It may also be affirmed from records of the highest credit and authority, that the *inquisition* erected by the *jesuits* at *Goa*, and the penal laws whose terrors they employed, so freely, in propagation of the gospel, contributed much more than their arguments and exhortations, which were but sparingly used, to engage the Indians to embrace Christianity [e]. The converting zeal of the *Franciscans* and *Dominicans*, which had, for a long time, been not only cooled, but almost totally extinguished, was animated, anew, by the example of the *jesuits*. And several other religious orders, that

[(b) When the fanatic, *IGNATIUS*, first solicited the confirmation of his order by the Roman pontif, *PAUL III*, the learned and worthy cardinal *GUIDICIONI* opposed his request with great vehemence. But this opposition was vanquished by the dexterity of *IGNATIUS*, who, changing the article of his *institution*, in which he had promised obedience to the pope with certain restrictions, turned it in such a manner as to bind his order by a solemn vow of *implicit, blind, and unlimited submission and obedience* to the Roman pontif. This change produced the desired effect, and made the popes look upon the *jesuits* as the chief support of their authority; and hence the zeal which *Rome* has ever shewn for that order, and that even at present, when their secret enormities have been brought to light, and procured the suppression of their society in *Portugal* and in *France*; where their power was so extensive. It is indeed remarkable, that *IGNATIUS* and his company, in the very same charter of their order in which they declare their implicit and blind allegiance to the court of *Rome*, promise a like implicit and unlimited allegiance to the general of their society, notwithstanding the impossibility of serving two absolute masters, whose commands may be often contradictory. See *Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus*, printed at *Utrecht* in 1741, tom. i. p. 77, &c.]

[(c) See *JO. ALB. FABRICII Lux Evangelii toti orbi exorients*, cap. xxxiii. p. 550.

[(d) *B. CHRIST. EBERH. WEISMANNI Oratio de virtutibus et vitiis Mission. Romanar. in Orat. ejus Academ.* p. 286.

[(e) See the *Hist. de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. ii. p. 171. 207.

Numbered

slumbered in their cells, were roused from their lethargy, if not by a principle of envy, at least by a spirit of emulation. CENT. XVI.

III. Of all the jesuits, who distinguished themselves by their zealous and laborious attempts to extend the limits of the church, none acquired a more shining reputation than FRANCIS XAVIER, who is commonly called the *Apostle of the Indians* [f]. An undaunted resolution, and no small degree of genius and sagacity, rendered this famous missionary one of the properest persons that could be employed in such an arduous task. Accordingly, in the year 1522, he set sail for the Portuguese settlements in *India*, and, in a short space of time, spread the knowledge of the Christian, or to speak more properly of the Popish religion, over a great part of the continent, and in several of the islands of that remote region. From thence, in the year 1529, he passed into *Japan*, and laid there, with amazing rapidity, the foundations of the famous church, which flourished, during so many years, in that vast empire. His indefatigable zeal prompted him to attempt the conversion of the Chinese, and with this view he embarked for that extensive and powerful kingdom, in sight of which he ended his days in the year 1552 [g]. After his death, other members of his insinuating order penetrated into *China*. The chief of these was MATTHEW RICCI, an Italian, who, by his skill in the Mathematics, became so acceptable to the Chinese nobility, and even to their emperor, that he obtained both for himself and his associates the liberty of explaining to the people the doctrines of the gospel [h]. This famous missionary may, therefore, be considered as the parent and founder of the Christian churches, which, though often dispersed and tossed to and fro by the storms of persecution, subsist, nevertheless, still in *China* [i].

The propagation of the gospel in India, Japan, and China.

IV. The jurisdiction and territories of those princes, who had thrown off the papal yoke, being confined within the limits of *Europe*, the churches that were under their protection could contribute but little to the propagation of the gospel in those distant regions of which we have been speaking. It is, however, recorded in history, that, in the year 1556, fourteen protestant missionaries were sent from *Geneva* to convert the Americans [k], though it is not

The attempts of the protestants towards the propagation of the gospel in foreign parts.

[f] The late king of *Portugal* obtained for XAVIER, or rather for his memory, the title of *Protector of the Indies*, from BENEDICT XIV, in the year 1747. See the *Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses des Missions Etrangeres*, tom. xliii. Pref. p. 36. The body of this sainted missionary lies interred at *Goa*, where it is worshiped with the highest marks of devotion. There is also a magnificent church at *Cotati* dedicated to *Xavier*, to whom the inhabitants of that Portuguese settlement pay the most devout tribute of veneration and worship. See *Lettres Edifiantes*, &c. tom. iii. p. 85, 89, 203. tom. v. p. 38—48. tom. vi. p. 78.

[g] See the writers enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii*, &c. cap. xxxix. p. 677. Add to these, LAFITAU *Histoire des Decouvertes des Portugais dans le nouveau Monde*, tom. iii. p. 419, 424. tom. iv. p. 63, 102.—*Histoire de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. i. p. 92.

[h] J. B. DU HALDE *Description de l'Empire de la Chine*, tom. iii. p. 84. edit. *Holland*.

[i] It appears, however, that before the arrival of RICCI in *China*, some of the Dominicans had already been there, though to little purpose. See LE QUIEN *Oriens Christianus*, tom. iii. p. 1354.

[k] PICTETI *Oratio de Trophæis Christi*, in *Orat. ejus*, p. 570.—There is no doubt, but that the doctors here mentioned were those which the illustrious admiral COLIGNI invited into *France*, when, in the year 1555, he had formed the project of sending a colony of protestants into *Brasil* and *America*. See CHARLEVOIX *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, tom. i. p. 22.

CENT. XVI. well known who was the promoter of this pious design, nor with what success it was carried into execution. The English also, who, towards the conclusion of this century, sent colonies into the northern parts of *America*, transplanted with them the reformed religion which they themselves professed; and, as their possessions were extended and multiplied from time to time, their religion also made a considerable progress among that rough and uncivilized people. We learn, moreover, that about this time the Swedes exerted their religious zeal in converting to Christianity many of the inhabitants of *Finland* and *Lapland*, of whom a considerable number had hitherto retained the impious and extravagant superstitions of their Pagan ancestors.

The enemies of
Christianity.

V. It does not appear, from authentic records of history, that the sword of persecution was drawn against the Gospel, or any public opposition made to the progress of Christianity during this century. And it would betray a great ignorance, both of the situation, opinions, and maxims of the Turks, to imagine, that the war they waged against the Christians was carried on upon religious principles, or with a view to maintain and promote the doctrines of MAHOMET. On the other hand, it is certain, that there lay concealed, in different parts of *Europe*, several persons who entertained a virulent enmity against religion in general, and, in a more especial manner, against the religion of the gospel; and who, both in their writings and in private conversation, sowed the seeds of impiety and error, and instilled their odious principles into weak, unsteady, and credulous minds. In this pernicious and unhappy class are generally placed several of the Peripatetic philosophers, who adorned *Italy* by their erudition, and particularly POMPONATIUS; several French wits and philosophers, such as JOHN BODIN, RABELAIS, MONTAGNE, BONAVENTURE DES PERIERES, DOLET, CHARRON; several Italians, at whose head appears the Roman pontif, LEO X, followed by PETER BEMBO, POLITIAN, JORDANO BRUNO, OCHINO; and some Germans, such as THEOPHRASTUS PARACELSUS, NICHOLAS TAURELLUS, and others [1]. It is even reported, that, in certain provinces of *France* and *Italy*, schools were erected, from whence whole swarms of these impious doctors soon issued out to deceive the simple and unwary. This accusation will not be rejected, in the lump, by such as are acquainted with the spirit and genius of these times; nor can it be said with truth, that all the persons, charged with this heavy reproach, were entirely guiltless. It is, nevertheless, certain, on the other hand, that, upon an accurate and impartial examination of this matter, it will appear, that the accusation brought against many of them is entirely groundless; and that, with respect to several, who may be worthy of censure in a certain degree, their errors are less pernicious and criminal, than they are uncharitably or rashly represented to be.

The public advantages that
arose from the
restoration of
letters.

VI. It is, at the same time, evident, that, in this century, the arts and sciences were carried to a degree of perfection unknown to preceding ages; and from this happy renovation of learning, the European churches de-

[1] See REIMANNI *Historia Atheismi at Atheorum*. Hildesf. 1725, in 8^{vo}.—JO. FARRER. *Deus Theſibus de Atheismo et Superſtitione*, cap. i.—*Dictionnaire de BAYLE*, passim.

rived the most signal and inestimable advantages, which they also transmitted CENT. XVI. to the most remote and distant nations. The benign influence of true science, and its tendency to improve both the form of religion and the institutions of civil policy, were perceived by many of the states and princes of *Europe*. Hence large sums were expended, and great zeal and industry employed in promoting the progress of knowledge, by founding and encouraging literary societies, by protecting and exciting a spirit of emulation among men of genius, and by annexing distinguished honours and advantages to the culture of the sciences. And it is particularly worthy of observation, that this was the period, when the wise and salutary law, which excludes ignorant and illiterate persons from the sacred functions of the Christian ministry, acquired, at length, that force which it still retains in the greatest part of the Christian world. There still remained, however, some seeds of that ancient discord between religion and philosophy, that had been sown and fomented by ignorance and fanaticism; and there were found, both among the friends and enemies of the reformation, several well-meaning, but inconsiderate men, who, in spite of common sense, maintained with more vehemence and animosity than ever, that vital religion and piety could never flourish until it was totally separated from learning and science, and nourished by the holy simplicity that reigned in the primitive ages of the church.

VII. The first rank in the literary world was now held by those, who consecrated their studious hours and their critical sagacity to the publication, correction, and illustration of the most famous Greek and Latin authors of ancient times, to the study of antiquity and the languages, and to the culture of eloquence and poetry. We see by the productions of this age (that yet remain, and continue to excite the admiration of the learned) that in all the provinces of *Europe* these branches of literature were cultivated, with a kind of enthusiasm, by such as were most distinguished by their taste and genius; nay, what is still more extraordinary (and perhaps not a little extravagant) the welfare of the church and the prosperity of the state was supposed to depend upon the improvement of these branches of erudition, which were considered as the very essence of true and solid knowledge. If such encomiums were swelled beyond the bounds of truth and wisdom by enthusiastical philologists, it is, nevertheless, certain, that the species of learning, here under consideration, was of the highest importance, as it opened the way that led to the treasures of solid wisdom, to the improvement of genius, and thus undoubtedly contributed, in a great measure, to deliver both reason and religion from the prepossessions of ignorance and the servitude of superstition [m]. And, therefore, we ought not to be fur-

The flourishing
state of philo-
logy.

[(m) Many vehement debates have been carried on concerning the respective merit of *Literature* and *Philosophy*. But these debates are almost as absurd, as a comparison that should be made between the *means* and the *end*, the *instrument* and its *effect*. *Literature* is the key by which we often open the treasures of wisdom, both human and divine. But as the sordid miser converts absurdly the means into an end, and acquires a passion for the shining metal, considered abstractedly from the purposes it was designed to serve, so the Pedantic philologist erects literature into an independent science, and contemns the divine treasures of philosophy, which it was designed both to discover and prize,

CENT. XVI.

The state of philosophy.

prized, when we meet with persons who exaggerate the merit, and dwell beyond measure on the praises, of those, who were our first guides from the regions of darkness and error into the smiling sphere of evidence and truth.

VIII. Though the lovers of philology and Belles Lettres were much superior in number to those who turned their principal views to the study of philosophy; yet the latter were far from being contemptible either in point of number or capacity. The philosophers were divided into two classes, of which the one was wholly absorbed in contemplation, while the other was employed in the investigation of truth, and endeavoured by experience, as well as by reasoning, to trace out the laws and operations of nature. The former were subdivided into two sects, of which the one followed certain leaders, while the other, unrestrained by the dictates of authority, struck out a new way for themselves, following freely their own inventions. Those, who submitted to the direction of certain philosophical guides, enlisted themselves under the standards of ARISTOTLE, or those of PLATO, who continued still to have many admirers, especially in *Italy*. Nor were the followers of ARISTOTLE agreed among themselves; they all acknowledged the Stagirite as their chief, but they followed him through very different paths. Some were for retaining the ancient method of proceeding in philosophical pursuits, which their doctors, falsely, called the Peripatetic system. Others pleaded for the pure and unmixed philosophy of ARISTOTLE, and recommended the writings of that Grecian sage, as the source of wisdom, and as the system, which was most adapted, when properly illustrated and explained, to the instruction of youth. A third sort of Aristotelicians, who differed equally from those now mentioned, and of whom the celebrated MELANCTHON was the chief, pursued another method. They extracted the marrow out of the lucubrations of ARISTOTLE, illustrated it by the aids of genuine literature and the rules of good criticism, and corrected it by the dictates of right reason and the doctrines and principles of true religion.

Of those, who struck out a path to themselves in the regions of philosophy, without any regard to that which had been opened by ancient sages, and pursued by their followers, CARDAN [n], TELESIO [o], and CAM-

and to illustrate. Hence that wretched tribe of *word-catchers that live on syllables* (as POPE, I think, happily expresses their tasteless pursuits) who make the republic of letters groan under their commentaries, annotations, various readings, &c. and forget that the knowledge of *words* and languages was intended to lead us to the improvement of the mind and to the knowledge of *things*.]

[(n) CARDAN was a man of a bold, irregular, enterprising genius, who, by a wild imagination, was led into the study of astrology and magic, by which he excited the astonishment and attracted the veneration of the multitude, while his real merit as a philosopher was little known. He was accused of atheism, but seems much rather chargeable with superstition. His life and character was an amazing mixture of wisdom and folly, and nothing can give a more unfavourable idea of his temper and principles, than the hideous portrait he has drawn of himself in his book *De genituris*. His knowledge of physic and mathematics was considerable, and his notions of natural philosophy may be seen in his famous book *De subtilitate et varietate rerum*, in which some important truths and discoveries are mixed with the most fanatical visions, and the most extravagant and delirious effusions of mystical folly. See the ample and judicious account that has been given of the character and philosophy of this writer (whose voyage to England and Scotland is well

PANELLA

PANELLA [p] hold, deservedly, the first rank, as they were, undoubtedly, CENT. XVI. men of superior genius, though too much addicted to the suggestions and visions of an irregular fancy. To these may be added PETER RAMUS, that subtle and ingenious French philosopher, who, by attempting to substitute in the place of ARISTOTLE's logic, a method of reasoning more adapted to the use of rhetoric and the improvement of eloquence, excited such a terrible uproar in the Gallic schools. Nor must we omit here the mention of THEOPHRASTUS PARACELSUS, who, by an assiduous observation of nature, by a great number of experiments indefatigably repeated, and by applying the penetrating force of fire [q] to discover the first principles or elements of bodies, endeavoured to cast new light and evidence on the important science of natural philosophy. As the researches of this industrious inquirer into nature excited the admiration of all, his example was consequently followed by many; and hence arose a new sect of philosophers, who assumed the de-

known) by the learned BRUCKER, in his *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*, tom. iv. part. II. lib. i. cap. iii.]

[(o) This philosopher, less known than the former, was born A. D. 1508, at *Cosensa*, in the kingdom of *Naples*, and was the restorer of the philosophy formerly taught by PARMENIDES, upon whose principles he built a new system, or, at least, a system, which appeared new by the elegant connexion which TELESÍUS gave to its various parts, and the arguments he used to maintain and support it against the philosophy of ARISTOTLE. It was the vague and uncertain method of reasoning, which the Stagirite had introduced into natural philosophy, that engaged TELESÍUS to compose his famous book *De principiis rerum naturalium*. In this work, after having refuted the visionary principles of the Aristotelian philosophy, he substitutes in their place, such as are immediately derived from the testimony of the senses, even *heat* and *cold*, from which, like PARMENIDES, he deduces the nature, origin, qualities, and changes of all material beings. To these two principles he adds a third, *viz. Matter*, and on these three builds, with dexterity enough, his physical system, for a part of which he seems also to have been indebted to a book of PLUTARCH; *De primo frigido*. It will be entertaining to the philosophical reader to compare this work of TELESÍUS, with Lord BACON's physical account of the story of *Cupid* and *Coelus*, in his book *De principiis et originibus*, &c.]

[(p) CAMPANELLA, a native of *Calabria*, made a great noise, in the seventeenth century, by his innovations in philosophy. Shocked at the atheism and absurdities of the Aristotelian system, he acquired early a contempt of it, and turned his pursuits towards something more solid, perusing the writings of all the ancient sages, and comparing them with the great volume of nature, to see whether the pretended copies resembled the original. The sufferings that this man endured are almost incredible, but they were said to be inflicted on him in consequence of the treasonable practices that were imputed to him, partly against the court of *Spain*, and partly against the kingdom of *Naples*, which he had formed the design of delivering into the hands of the Turks. He was freed from his prison and tortures by the interposition of Pope URBAN VIII, who gave him particular marks of his favour and esteem; and, finding that he was not safe at *Rome*, had him conveyed to *Paris*, where he was honoured with the protection of LEWIS XIII and Cardinal RICHLIEU, and ended his days in peace. As to the writings and philosophy of this great man, they are tinged, indeed, with the colour of the times, and bear, in many places, the marks of a chimerical and undisciplined imagination; but among a few visionary notions, they contain a great number of important truths. He undertook an entire reformation of philosophy, but was unequal to the task. For an account of his principles of logic, ethics, and natural philosophy, see BRUCKER's *Hist. Critica Philosophiæ*, tom. iv. part. II. p. 127, &c. He was accused of atheism, but unjustly; he was also accused of suggesting cruel measures against the protestants, and not without reason.]

[(q) The principal merit of PARACELSUS consisted in inventing, or, at least, restoring from oblivion and darkness the important science of *Chemistry*, giving it a regular form, reducing it into a connected system, and applying it most successfully to the art of healing, which was the peculiar profession of this philosopher, whose friends and enemies have drawn him in the falsest colours. His application to the study of *Magic*, which he treats of in the tenth volume of his works, under

CENT. XVI. nomination of *Theosophists* [r], and who, placing little confidence in the decisions of human reason, or the efforts of speculation, attributed all to divine illumination and repeated experience.

The method of teaching theology improved.

IX. This revolution in philosophy and literature, together with the spirit of emulation that animated the different sects or classes into which the learned men of this age were divided, produced many happy effects of various kinds. It, in a more particular manner, brought into disrepute, though it could not at once utterly eradicate, that intricate, barbarous, and insipid method of teaching theology, that had universally prevailed hitherto in all the schools and pulpits of Christendom. The sacred writings, which, in the preceding ages, had been either entirely neglected, or very absurdly explained, were now much more consulted and respected in the debates and writings of the Christian doctors than they had formerly been; the sense and language of the inspired writers were more carefully studied, and more accurately unfolded; the doctrines and precepts of religion taught with more method, connexion, and perspicuity; and that dry, barren, and unaffecting language, which the ancient schoolmen affected so much in their theological compositions, was wholly exploded by the wiser part of the divines of this century. It must not, however, be imagined, that this reformation of the schools was so perfect, as to leave no new improvements to be made by succeeding ages; this, indeed, was far from being the case. Much imperfection yet remained in the method of treating theology, and many things, which had great need of a correcting hand, were left untouched. It would, nevertheless, be either an instance of ingratitude, or a mark of great ignorance, to deny this age the honour of having begun what was afterwards more happily finished, and of having laid the foundations of that striking superiority, which the divines of succeeding ages obtained over those of ancient times.

And the genius and spirit of the Christian religion better explained.

X. Nor did the improvements, which have been now mentioned, as proceeding from the restoration of letters and philosophy, extend only to the method of conveying theological instruction, but purified moreover the science of theology itself. For the true nature, genius, and design of the Christian religion, which even the most learned and pious doctors of antiquity had but imperfectly comprehended, were now unfolded with evidence and precision, and drawn, like truth, from an abyss in which they had hitherto lain too much concealed. 'Tis true, the influence of error was far from being totally suppressed, and many false and absurd doctrines are still maintained and propagated in the Christian world. But it may, nevertheless, be affirmed, that the Christian societies, whose errors, at this day, are the most numerous and extravagant, have much less absurd and perverse

the denomination of the *Sagacious Philosophy*, is a circumstance dishonourable to his memory, and nothing can discover a more total absence of common sense and reason, than his discourses on that subject. As to his philosophical system, it is so obscure, and so contradictory, that we shall not pretend to delineate it here.]

[r] See, for an ample account of the lives, transactions, and systems of these philosophers, BAUKER's *Historia Critica Philosophiae*.

notions

SECT. II. *The State of LEARNING and PHILOSOPHY.*

notions of the nature and design of the gospel, and the duties and obligations of those that profess it, than were entertained by those doctors of antiquity, who ruled the church with an absolute authority, and were considered as the chief oracles of theology. It may farther be observed, that the reformation contributed much to soften and civilize the manners of many nations, who, before that happy period, were sunk in the most savage stupidity, and carried the most rude and unsociable aspect. It must, indeed, be confessed, that a variety of circumstances combined to produce that lenity of character, and that milder temperature of manners, maxims, and actions, that discovered themselves gradually, and increased, from day to day, in the greatest part of the European nations after the period that LUTHER rendered so famous. It is, nevertheless, evident, beyond all contradiction, that the disputes concerning religion, and the accurate and rational inquiries into the doctrines and duties of Christianity, to which these disputes gave rise, had a great tendency to eradicate out of the minds of men that ferocity that had been so long nourished by the barbarous suggestions of unmanly superstition. It is also certain, that at the very dawn of this happy revolution in the state of Christianity, and even before its salutary effects were manifested in all their extent, pure religion had many sincere and fervent votaries, though they were concealed from public view by the multitudes of fanatics, with which they were surrounded on all sides.

The happy revolution that, in many places, delivered Christianity from the yoke of superstition and spiritual tyranny. This system of ecclesiastical policy, extensive as it is, is under the direction of the bishop of Rome, who, by virtue of a sort of hereditary succession, claims the authority, privileges, and rights of St. Peter, the supposed prince of the apostles, and himself out for the supreme head of the universal church, the vicar of Christ upon earth. This lordly ruler of the church is, at this time, elected to his high office by the chosen members of the Roman clergy, who bear the ancient denomination of cardinals. Of these, as are styled within the precincts of Rome; fifty are ministers of the Roman churches, and are styled priests or presbyters; and fourteen are inspectors of the hospitals and almshouses, and are called deacons. These cardinals, while the papal chair is vacant, and they are employed in the choice of a successor to the deceased pontiff, are shut up and closely confined in a certain sort of prison, called the Conclave, that they may thus be engaged to bring this difficult matter to a speedy conclusion. No person, that is not an Italian by birth, and has not already obtained a place in the college of cardinals, is capable of being raised to the head of the church; nor have all the Italian cardinals the privilege of aspiring to this high office [a]. Some are rendered incapable of being

[a] See Jo. Fried. MAYERI Commentarius de Electione Pontificis Romani, published in 1702 at Hamburg, in the year 1691. The ceremonial observed in the election and installation is amply described in a work published at Frankfurt in the year 1732, under the following title: *Ceremoniae Electionis et Coronationis Pontificis Romani*.

SECTION III.

The PARTICULAR HISTORY of the CHURCH.

PART I.

The HISTORY of the ANCIENT CHURCHES.

CHAPTER I.

The HISTORY of the ROMAN or LATIN CHURCH.

CENT. XVI. I.

The Roman
pontif,—how
elected?

THE Roman or Latin church is a system of government, whose jurisdiction extends to a great part of the known world, though its authority has been circumscribed within narrower limits since the happy revolution that, in many places, delivered Christianity from the yoke of superstition and spiritual tyranny. This system of ecclesiastical policy, extensive as it is, is under the direction of the bishop of *Rome* alone, who, by virtue of a sort of *hereditary succession*, claims the authority, prerogatives, and rights of St. PETER, the *supposed* prince of the apostles, and gives himself out for the *supreme head* of the universal church, the *vice-gerent* of Christ upon earth. This lordly ruler of the church is, at this time, elected to his high office by the chosen members of the Roman clergy, who bear the ancient denomination of *cardinals*. Of these, *six* are *bishops* within the precincts of *Rome*; *fifty* are ministers of the Roman churches, and are called *priests* or *presbyters*; and *fourteen* are inspectors of the hospitals and charity-houses, and are called *deacons*. These *cardinals*, while the papal chair is vacant, and they are employed in the choice of a successor to the deceased pontif, are shut up and closely confined in a certain sort of prison, called the *Conclave*, that they may thus be engaged to bring this difficult matter to a speedy conclusion. No person, that is not an Italian by birth, and has not already obtained a place in the college of cardinals, is capable of being raised to the head of the church; nor have all the Italian cardinals the privilege of aspiring to this high office [a]. Some are rendered incapable of filling

[a] See JO. FRID. MAYERI *Commentarius de Electione Pontif. Romani*, published in 4^{to} at Hamburg, in the year 1691. The ceremonial observed in the *election* and *installation* is amply described by MEYERCHENIUS, in a work published at *Frankfort* in the year 1732, under the following title: *Ceremoniale Electionis et Coronationis Pontificis Romani*.

the papal chair by the place of their birth, others by their manner of life, CENT. XVI. and a few by other reasons of a more incidental nature [b]. It is also to be observed, that the emperor, the kings of *France* and *Spain* have acquired, whether expressly by stipulation, or, imperceptibly through custom, the privilege of excluding from the number of the candidates for this high office such as they think proper to oppose or dislike. Hence it often happens, that, in the numerous college of cardinals, a very small number are permitted, upon a vacancy, to aspire at the papacy; the greatest part being generally prevented by their birth, their character, their circumstances, and by the force of political intrigues from flattering themselves with the pleasing hope of ascending that towering summit of ecclesiastical power and dominion.

II. It must not be imagined, that the personal power and authority of the Roman pontiffs are circumscribed by no limits; since it is well known, that, in all his decisions relating to the government of the church, he previously consults the *bretbren*, i. e. the cardinals, who compose his ministry or privy council. Nay more, in matters of religious controversy and doctrine, he is obliged to ask the advice and opinion of eminent divines, in order to secure his pretended infallibility from the suggestions of error. Besides this, all matters, that are not of the highest moment and importance, are divided, according to their respective nature, into certain classes, and left to the management of certain colleges, called *Congregations* [c], in every one

The power of
the pope, limit-
ed.

[b] The great obstacle that prevents several cardinals from aspiring at the pontificate, is what they call at *Rome*, *il peccato originale*, or *original sin*. This mark of exclusion belongs to those who are born subjects of some crown, or republic, which is not within the bounds of *Italy*, or which are upon a footing of jealousy with the court of *Rome*. Those also, who were made cardinals by the nomination of the kings of *France* or *Spain*, or their adherents, are also included in this imputation of *original sin*, which excludes from the papal chair. The accidental circumstances that exclude certain cardinals from the pontificate, are their being born princes or independent sovereigns, or, their declaring themselves openly in favour of certain courts, or, their family's being too numerous, or, their morals being irregular. Even youth and a good complexion and figure are considered as obstacles. But all these maxims and rules vary and change according to the inconstant and precarious impulse of policy and faction.

For an account of the different methods of electing the pope, whether by *compromise*, *inspiration*, *serenity*, or *access* (by which latter is meant a *second election* employed when the other methods fail) see *ARMON Tableau de la Cour de Rome*, edit. 2^{de}, p. 40, &c.]

[c] These congregations are, as follow: I. *The congregation of the Pope*, instituted first by SIXTUS V., to prepare the matters that were to be brought before the *consistory*, at which the pontif is always present. Hence this is called the *consistorial congregation*, and, in it, are treated all affairs relative to the erection of bishoprics and cathedral churches, the reunion or suppression of episcopal sees, the alienation of church goods, and the taxes and *annates* that are imposed upon all benefices in the pope's giving. The cardinal-dean presides in this assembly. II. *The congregation of the Inquisition*, or (as it is otherwise called) *of the Holy Office*, instituted by PAUL III., which takes cognizance of heresies, apostacy, magic, and profane writings, which assemble thrice in the week, and every Thursday in presence of the pope, who presides in it. The office of *grand inquisitor*, which encroached upon the prerogatives of the pontif, has been long suppressed, or rather distributed among the cardinals, who belong to this congregation, and whose decisions come under the supreme cognizance of his Holiness. III. *The congregation for the propagation of the Roman-catholic Faith*, founded under the pontificate of GREGORY XV., composed of eighteen cardinals, one of the secretaries of state, a protonotary, a secretary of the Inquisition, and other members of less rank. Here it is, that the deliberations are carried on, which relate to the extirpation of

CENT. XVI. of which, one or more cardinals preside [d]. The decisions of these societies are generally approved of by the Roman pontif, who has not a right, without alledging the most weighty and evident reasons, to reverse what they pronounce to be just and expedient. This form of ecclesiastical government is,

heresy, the appointment of missionaries, &c. This congregation has built a most beautiful and magnificent palace in one of the most agreeable situations that could be chosen at Rome, where profelytes to popery from foreign countries are lodged and nourished gratis, in a manner suitable to their rank and condition, and instructed in those branches of knowledge to which the bent of their genius points. The prelates, curates, and vicars also, who are obliged, without any fault of theirs, to abandon the places of their residence, are entertained charitably in this noble edifice in a manner proportioned to their station in the church. IV. The congregation designed to explain the decisions of the council of Trent. V. The congregation of the Index, whose principal business is to examine manuscripts and books that are designed for publication, to decide whether the people may be permitted to read them, to correct those books whose errors are not numerous, and which contain useful and salutary truths, to condemn those, whose principles are heretical and pernicious, and to grant the peculiar privilege of perusing heretical books to certain persons. This congregation, which is sometimes held in presence of the pope, but generally in the palace of the cardinal-president, has a more extensive jurisdiction than that of the inquisition, as it not only takes cognizance of those books that contain doctrines contrary to the Roman-catholic faith, but of those also that concern the duties of morality, the discipline of the church, and the interests of society. Its name is derived from the alphabetical Tables or Indexes of heretical books and authors, which have been composed by its appointment. VI. The congregation for maintaining the rights and immunities of the Clergy, and of the Knights of Malta. This congregation was formed by URBAN VIII. to decide the disputes and remove the difficulties and inconveniencies that arose from the trials of ecclesiastics, before princes or other lay-judges. VII. The congregation relating to the Bishops and regular Clergy, instituted by SIXTUS V. to decide the debates which arise between the bishops and their diocesans, and to compose the differences that happen so frequently among the Monastic orders. VIII. The congregation, appointed by GREGORY XIV. for examining into the capacity and learning of the bishops: IX. Another for inquiring into their lives and morals: X. A third for obliging them to reside in their dioceses, or to dispense them from that obligation. XI. The congregation for suppressing monasteries, i. e. such, whose revenues are exhausted, and who thereby become a charge upon the public. XII. The congregation of the Apostolic Visitation, which names the visitors, who perform the duties and visitations of the churches and convents within the district of Rome, to which the pope is obliged as archbishop of that city. XIII. The congregation of Relicks, designed to examine the marks and to augment the number of those instruments of superstition. XIV. The congregation of Indulgences, designed to examine the case of those, who have recourse to this method of quieting the conscience. XV. The congregations of Rites, which SIXTUS V. appointed to regulate and invent the religious ceremonies, that are to be observed in the worship of each new saint, that is added to the Kalendar.

These are the congregations of cardinals, set apart for administering the spiritual affairs of the church, and they are undoubtedly, in some respects, a check upon the power of the pontif, enormous as it may be. There are six more which relate to the temporal government of the papal territories. In these congregations, where the pope is never present, all things are transacted, which relate to the execution of public justice in civil, or criminal matters, the levying of taxes, the providing the cities and provinces with good governors, the relieving those who are unjustly oppressed by subordinate magistrates, the coinage, the care of the rivers, aqueducts, bridges, roads, churches, and public edifices.]

[d] The court of Rome is very particularly and accurately described by ARMON (who had been, before his conversion to the protestant religion, domestic chaplain to INNOCENT XI) in a book, entitled, *Tableau de la Cour de Rome*, of which the first edition was published at the Hague in 8^{vo}, in the year 1707, and the second in 1726.—See also *Relation de la Cour de Rome, et des Ceremonies qui s'y observent*, which father LABAT has translated into French, from the Italian of Jeron-Limadoro, and subjoined to his *Voyages en Espagne et Italie*, tom. viii. p. 105.—For an account of the Roman congregations, &c. see DOROTH. ASCIAN. *De Monibus Pietatis Romanis*, p. 510. as also HUNOLD. *Plettenberg Notitia Tribunal. et Congregat. Curia Romana*. *Hildesheim*, in 8^{vo}, 1693.

doubtless,

doubtless, a check to the authority of the pope; and hence it is, that many things are transacted at *Rome* in a manner, that is in direct opposition to the sentiments of its spiritual ruler. This may serve to shew us, that those persons are little acquainted with the nature and limits of the papal hierarchy, who pretend, that all the iniquitous proceedings of the court of *Rome*, the calamities it has occasioned, the contentions, rebellions, and tumults it has excited, are to be entirely and wholly laid to the charge of the Roman pontif [e].

III. The power of the Roman pontif had excited debates even among those that are under the papal hierarchy; and the spiritual subjects of this, pretended, head of the church, are very far from being agreed with respect to the extent of his authority and jurisdiction. Hence it happens, that this authority and dominion are not the same in all places, having a larger scope in some provinces, and being reduced within narrower bounds in others. If, indeed, we consider only the pretensions of the pontif, then we shall find that his power is unlimited and supreme; for there are no prerogatives, that can flatter ambition, which he does not claim for himself and his court. He not only pretends, that the whole power and majesty of the church reside in his person, and are transmitted, in certain portions, from him to the inferior bishops, but moreover asserts the absolute infallibility of all decisions and decrees that he pronounces from his lordly tribunal. These arrogant pretensions are, however, opposed by many, and chiefly by the French nation, which expressly maintains, that every bishop receives immediately from Christ himself a portion of that spiritual power which is imparted to the church; that the collective sum, or whole of this power, is lodged in the collective body of its pastors, or, which is the same thing, in a general council, lawfully assembled; and that the pontif considered personally, and as distinct from the church, is liable to error. This complicated and important controversy may be easily brought within narrower bounds, and may be reduced to the following plain question: *viz. Is the Roman pontif, properly speaking, the LAWGIVER of the church, or, is he no more than the GUARDIAN and DEPOSITARY of the laws enacted by Christ and by the church?* There is no prospect of seeing this question decided, nor the debates terminated to which it has given rise; since the contending parties are not even agreed about the proper and lawful judge of this important controversy [f]. Some great revolution can only effect the decision of this matter.

Debates arise concerning the power of the Roman pontif.

[e] Hence arises that important distinction frequently employed by the French and other nations in their debates with the Roman pontif, I mean, the distinction between the *Pope of Rome*, and the *Court of Rome*. The latter is often loaded with the bitterest reproaches and the heaviest accusations; while the former is spared, and in some measure excused. Nor is this distinction by any means groundless; since the cardinals and congregations, whose rights and privileges are held sacred, undertake and execute many projects without the knowledge, and sometimes against the will and consent of the Roman pontif.

[f] The arguments, employed by the creatures of the Roman pontif in defence of his unlimited authority, may be seen in BELLARMINE and other writers, of which an enormous collection has been made by ROCCABERTI; and, what is not a little extraordinary, a French writer, named

IV. The

CENT. XIV.

The declension
of the church of
Rome.

IV. The church of *Rome* lost much of its ancient splendor and majesty, as soon as LUTHER, and the other luminaries of the reformation, had exhibited to the view of European nations the Christian religion restored, at least, to a considerable part of its native purity, and delivered from many of the superstitions, under which it had lain so long disfigured. Among the most opulent states of *Europe*, several withdrew entirely from the jurisdiction of *Rome*; in others, certain provinces threw off the yoke of papal tyranny; and, upon the whole, this defection produced a striking diminution, both of the wealth and power of the Roman pontifs. It must also be observed, that even the kings, princes, and sovereign states who adhered to the religion of *Rome*, yet changed their sentiments with respect to the claims and pretensions of its bishop. If they were not persuaded by the writings of the protestants to renounce the superstitions of popery, yet they received most useful instruction from them in other matters of very great moment. They drew from these writings important discoveries of the groundless claims and unlawful usurpations of the Roman pontifs, and came, at length, to perceive, that, if the jurisdiction and authority of *Rome* continued the same, that it was before the rise of LUTHER, the rights of temporal princes and the majesty of civil government would, sooner or later, be absorbed in the gulph of papal avarice and ambition. Hence it was, that most of the sovereign states of *Europe*, partly by secret and prudent measures, partly by public negociations and remonstrances, set bounds to the daring ambition of *Rome*, which aimed at nothing less than universal dominion both in ecclesiastical and civil affairs; nor did the Roman pontif think it either safe or expedient to have recourse to the ancient arms of the church, *war* and *excommunication*, in order to repel these attacks upon his authority. Even those very kingdoms, who acknowledge the Roman pontif as the lawgiver of the church, and an infallible guide, confine, nevertheless, his power of enacting laws within narrow limits.

The methods
employed by the
Roman pontifs
to repair their
losses.

Missions.

V. In this declining state of their affairs, it was natural for the humbled pontifs to look about for some method of repairing their losses; and, for this purpose, they exerted much more zeal and industry, than had been shewn by their predecessors, in extending the limits of their spiritual dominion beyond *Europe*, and left no means unemployed of gaining proselytes and adherents in the *Indies*, both among the Pagan nations and the Christian sects. The Jesuits, as we have already had occasion to observe, were the first missionaries that were sent for this purpose into these distant parts of the world; but able men, selected out of the other Monastic orders, were afterwards employed in this arduous undertaking. If, however, we except the exploits of FRANCIS XAVIER, and his companions in *India*, *China*, and *Japan*, of which notice has been taken above, there were no great matters effected in this century; as, generally speaking, the persons,

PETITDIDIER, appeared in defence of the pope's pretensions, in a book published at *Luxemburg* in the year 1724, *Sur l'Autorité et l'Infallibilité des Papes*. The sentiments of the Gallican church, and the arguments by which it opposes the pretensions of *Rome*, may be seen in the writings of RICHER and LAUNOY.

who

who were set apart to execute this grand project, were not as yet endowed CENT. XVI. with that experience and dexterity that it necessarily required, and set about the work with more zeal than prudence and knowledge.

The Portuguese had, in the preceding century, opened a passage into the country of the Abyssinians, who professed the doctrine, and observed the religious rites, of the *Monophysites*; and this offered a favourable occasion of reducing this people under the papal yoke. Accordingly, JOHN BERMUDEZ was sent into *Ethiopia* for this purpose; and, that he might appear with a certain degree of dignity, he was clothed with the title of *Patriarch of the Abyssinians*. The same important commission was afterwards given to IGNATIUS LOYOLA, and the companions of his labours [g]; and at their first setting out, several circumstances, and particularly a war with a neighbouring prince, which the Abyssinian monarch was desirous of terminating by the powerful succours of the Portuguese, seemed to promise them a successful and happy ministry. But the event did not answer this fond expectation; and, in some time, it appeared plainly, that the Abyssinians stood too firm in the faith of their ancestors to be easily engaged to abandon and forsake it; so that, towards the conclusion of this century, the Jesuits had almost lost all hopes of succeeding in their attempts [h].

VI. The *Egyptians* or *Copts*, who were closely connected with the Abyssinians in their religious sentiments, and also in their external forms of worship, became next the objects of *Rome's* ambitious zeal; and, in the year 1562, CHRISTOPHER RODERIC, a Jesuit of note, was sent, by the express order of pope PIUS IV, to propagate the cause of popery among that people. This ecclesiastic, notwithstanding the rich presents and subtle arguments, by which he attempted to change the sentiments and shake the constancy of GABRIEL [i], who was, at that time, patriarch of *Alexandria*, returned to *Rome* with no other effect of his embassy than fair words, and a few compliments [k]. It is, however, true, that, towards the conclusion of this century, and during the pontificate of CLEMENT VIII, an embassy from another patriarch of *Alexandria*, whose name was also GABRIEL, appeared at *Rome*, and was considered as a subject of triumph and boasting by the crea-

The Egyptians
and Armenians.

[(g) It is certainly by mistake that Dr. MOSHEM mentions LOYOLA, as having made a voyage into *Abyssinia*. Jesuits were sent, at different periods, to that country, and with little success; but their founder was never there in person.]

[(h) See LUDOLFI *Histor. Aethiopica et Comm.*—GEDDES, *Church History of Ethiopia*, p. 1203—LE GRAND, *Dissertation de la Conversion des Abyssins*, which is to be found in the second volume of the *Voyage Historique d'Abyssinie* du R. P. JEROME LOBO, p. 13.—LA CROZE, *Histoire du Christianisme en Ethiopie*, liv. iii. p. 906.]

[(i) FRANC. SACHINI *Histor. Societatis Jesu* part. II. lib. v.—EUSEB. RENAUD, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrin.* p. 611.—*Hist. de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. iii. p. 314.]

[(k) This patriarch offered to send one of his bishops to the council of *Trent*, in order to get rid of the importunity of these Jesuits; but he refused, positively, the sending any of his young students to be educated among their order, and declared plainly, that he owed no obedience nor submission to the bishop of *Rome*, who had no more dignity nor authority than any other bishop, except within the bounds of his own diocese. See *Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. ii. p. 322. 324.]

CENT. XVI. tures of the pope [l]. But the more candid and sensible, even among the Roman-catholics, looked upon this embassy, and not without reason, as a stratagem of the Jesuits, to persuade the Abyssinians (who were so prone to follow the example of their brethren of *Alexandria*) to join themselves to the communion of *Rome*, and to submit to the authority and jurisdiction of its pontif [m]. It is, at least, certain, that, after this solemn embassy, we do not find in the records of history the smallest token of a propensity in the *Copts* to embrace the doctrine or discipline of *Rome*.

Many years before this period, a considerable sect of the Armenians had been accustomed to treat the Roman pontif with particular marks of veneration and respect, without departing, however, from the religious doctrine, discipline, or worship of their ancestors. Of this a farther account shall be given in the History of the Eastern Churches; it may, nevertheless, be proper to observe here, that the attachment of this sect to the bishop of *Rome* was greatly encreased, and the votaries of the pontif considerably multiplied, by the zeal of SERAPION, an opulent man, who was entirely devoted to the court of *Rome*, and who, by engaging himself to discharge the debts under which the Armenians groaned, obtained, in the year 1593, the title and dignity of Patriarch, though there were already two patriarchs at the head of the Armenian church. He did not, however, enjoy this dignity long; for, soon after his promotion, he was sent into exile by the Persian monarch, at the desire of those Armenians who adhered to the ecclesiastical discipline of their ancestors; and thus the boasting and exultation of the Romans subsided all of a sudden, and their hopes vanished [n].

Nestorians, and
Indians.

VII. The ambitious views of the Roman pontifs sowed the pestilential seeds of animosity and discord among all the eastern churches; and the Nestorian Christians, who are also known by the denomination of *Chaldeans*, felt, early, the effects of their imperious counsels. In the year 1551, a warm dispute arose among that people, about the creation of a new patriarch, SIMEON BARMAMAS being proposed by one party, and SULAKA earnestly desired by the other. The latter, to support his pretensions the more effectually, repaired to *Rome*, and was consecrated patriarch, in the year 1553, by pope JULIUS III, whose jurisdiction he had acknowledged, and to whose commands he had promised unlimited submission and obedience. JULIUS gave the name, JOHN, to the new Chaldean patriarch, and, upon his return to his own country, sent with him several persons, skilled in the Syriac

[l] The transactions of this embassy, adorned with an ample and pompous Preface, are subjoined to the sixth volume of the *Annal. Eccl.* of BARONIUS, p. 707. edit. *Amst.*

[m] RENAUDOT, in his *Hist. Patriarch. Alexandrin.* p. 611, 612, endeavours to maintain the credit and importance of this embassy, of which BARONIUS has given such a pompous account. He is, however, much mistaken when he asserts, that Father SIMON, relying upon the fallacious testimony of GEORGE DOUZA, was the only person that ever considered this embassy as a stratagem; since it is evident, that THOMAS à JESU, in the sixth book of his *Treatise De conversione omnium gentium procuranda*, has considered it in the same light, as well as several other writers. See GEDDES, *Church-History of Ethiopia*, p. 231, 232.

[n] See *Nouveaux Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus dans le Levant*, tom. iii. p. 132, 133.

language, to assist him in establishing and extending the papal empire among the Nestorians. From this time that unhappy people were divided into two factions, and were often involved in the greatest dangers and difficulties by the jarring sentiments and perpetual quarrels of their patriarchs [o].

The Nestorians, or, as they are more commonly called, the *Christians of St. Thomas*, who inhabited the maritime coasts of *India*, suffered much from the methods employed by the Portuguese to engage them to embrace the doctrine and discipline of the church of *Rome*, and to abandon the religion of their ancestors, which was much more simple, and infinitely less absurd [p]. The finishing stroke was put to the violence and brutality of these attempts by Don ALEXIS DE MENEZES, bishop of *Goa*, who, about the conclusion of this century, calling the Jesuits to his assistance, obliged this unhappy and reluctant people to embrace the religion of *Rome*, and to acknowledge the pope's supreme jurisdiction; against both of which acts they had always expressed the utmost abhorrence. These violent counsels and arrogant proceedings of MENEZES, and his associates, were condemned by such of the Roman-catholics as were most remarkable for their equity and wisdom [q].

VIII. The greatest part of the first legates and missionaries of the court of *Rome* treated with much severity and injustice the Christians whom they were desirous of gaining over to their communion. For they did not only require that these Christians should renounce the particular opinions that separated them from the Greek and Latin churches, and that they should acknowledge the Roman pontif as CHRIST's sole *vice-gerent* upon earth: their demands went still farther; they opposed many of the opinions of this people, some of which were, at least, worthy of toleration, and others highly agreeable to the dictates both of reason and scripture; they insisted upon the suppression and abolition of several customs, rites, and institutions, which had been handed down to them from their ancestors, and which were perfectly innocent in their nature and tendency; in a word, they would be satisfied with nothing less than an entire and minute conformity of the religious rites and opinions of this people, with the doctrine and worship of the church of *Rome*. The papal court, however, rendered wise by experience, perceived, at length, that this manner of proceeding was highly imprudent, and every way improper to extend the limits of the papal empire in the East. It was, therefore, determined to treat with more artifice and moderation a matter of such moment and importance, and the missionaries were, consequently, ordered to change the plan of their operations, and

[o] JOS. SIM. ASSERMANI *Bibliotheca Oriental. Clementino-Vaticana*, tom. iii. part. II. p. 164.
—See the *History of the Eastern Church* in the following chapter of this history.

[[p] For an account of the doctrines and worship of these, and the other eastern Christians, see the following Chapter:—As also two learned books of Monsieur LA CROZE, the one entitled, *Histoire du Christianisme des Indes*; and the other, *Histoire du Christianisme en Ethiopie*.]

[q] See LA CROZE, *Histoire du Christianisme aux Indes*, livr. ii. p. 88, &c. in which there is an ample account of the *Christians of St. Thomas*, and of the rough methods employed by MENEZES to gain them over to the church of *Rome*.

CENT. XVI. confine their views to the two following points: to wit, the subjection of these Christians to the jurisdiction of the Roman pontif, and their renouncing, or, at least, professing to renounce, the opinions that had been condemned in the general councils of the church. In all other matters, the Roman envoys were commanded to use a perfect toleration, and to let these people remain unmolested in following the sentiments and observing the institutions they had derived from their ancestors. To give the greater credit and plausibility to this new method of conversion, certain learned doctors of the church endeavoured to demonstrate, that the religious tenets of *Rome*, when explained according to the simplicity of truth, and not by the subtilties and definitions of the schools, differed very little from the opinions received in the Greek and the other eastern churches. But this demonstration was very far from being satisfactory, and it discovered less of an ingenuous spirit, than a disposition to gain proselytes with more appearance of success, by all sorts of means and at all events. Be that as it may; the cause of *Rome* received much more advantage from this plan of moderation than it had derived from the severity of its former counsels; though much less than the authors of this reconciling plan fondly expected.

The internal constitution of the church of *Rome* strengthened in various ways.

IX. While the Roman pontifs were using their utmost efforts to extend their dominion abroad, they did not neglect the means that were proper to strengthen and maintain it at home. On the contrary, from the dawn of the reformation, they began to redouble their diligence in defending the internal form and constitution of the church of *Rome* against the dexterity and force of its adversaries. They could, no more, have recourse to the expedient of *crusades*, by which they had so often diminished the power and influence of their enemies. The revolutions that had happened in the affairs of *Rome*, and in the state of *Europe*, rendered any such method of subduing heretics, visionary, and impracticable. Other methods were, therefore, to be found out, and all the resources of prudence were to be exhausted in support of a declining church. Hence the laws and procedures of the *inquisition* were revised, and corrected in those countries where that formidable court is permitted to exert its dreadful power. Colleges and schools of learning were erected in various places, in which the studious youth were trained up, by perpetual exercise, in the art of disputing, that thus they might wield with more dexterity and success the arms of controversy against the enemies of *Rome*. The circulation of such books as were supposed to have a pernicious tendency, was either entirely prevented, or, at least, much obstructed by certain lists or indexes, composed by men of learning and sagacity, and published by authority, in which these books were marked with a note of infamy and their perusal prohibited, though with certain restrictions. The pursuit of knowledge was earnestly recommended to the clergy, and honourable marks of distinction, as well as ample rewards were bestowed on those, who made the most remarkable progress in the cultivation of letters. And, to enlarge no farther on this head, the youth, in general, were more carefully instructed in the principles and precepts of their religion, than they had formerly been. Thus it happens that signal advantages are frequently

frequently derived from what are looked upon as the greatest evils, and much wisdom and improvement are daily learning in the school of opposition and adversity. It is more than probable, that the church of *Rome* would never have been enriched with the acquisitions we have now been mentioning, had it continued in that state of uninterrupted ease and undisputed authority that nourish a spirit of indolence and luxury, and had not the pretended heretics attacked its territories, trampled upon its jurisdiction, and eclipsed a great part of its ancient majesty and splendor.

XI. The Monastic orders and religious societies have been always considered by the Roman pontiffs as the principal support of their authority and dominion. It is chiefly by them that they rule the church, maintain their influence on the minds of the people, and augment the number of their votaries. And, indeed, various causes contribute to render the connexion between the pontiff and these religious communities much more intimate, than that which subsists between him and the other clergy, of whatever rank or order we may suppose them to be. It was therefore judged necessary, when the success of *LUTHER* and the progress of the reformation had effaced such a considerable part of the majesty of *Rome*, to found some new religious fraternity, that should, in a particular manner, be devoted to the interests of the Roman pontiff, and the very express end of whose institution should be to renew the vigour of a declining hierarchy, to heal the deep wound it had received, to preserve those parts of the papal dominions that remained yet entire, and to augment them by new accessions. This was so much the more necessary, as the two famous *Mendicant* societies [r], by whose ministry the popes had chiefly governed during many ages, and that with the greatest success and glory, had now lost, on several accounts, a considerable part of their influence and authority, and were thereby less capable of serving the church with efficacy and vigour than they had formerly been. What the pontiff sought for, in this declining state of his affairs, was found in that famous and most powerful society, which deriving its title from the name of *JESUS*, were commonly called *Jesuits*, while they were styled by their enemies *Loyolites*, and sometimes *Inghists* [s], from the Spanish name of their founder [t]. This founder was *IGNATIUS LOYOLA*, a Spanish knight, who, from an illiterate soldier, became an unparalleled fanatic; a fanatic, indeed, of a fertile and enterprising genius [u], who, after having passed through various scenes of life, came to *Rome*, and, being there directed by the prudent counsels of persons much wiser than himself, was rendered capable of in-

Ignatius Loyola
the founder of
the order called
Jesuits.

[r] These two orders were the Franciscans and the Dominicans.]

[s] The Spanish name of the founder of the order of Jesuits was *Don INIGO DE GUIPUSCOA*.]

[t] The writers who have given the most particular and circumstantial accounts of the order of the Jesuits are enumerated by *CHRISTOPH. AUG. SALIG.* in his *Historia August. Confessionis*, tom. ii. p. 73.

[u] Many Jesuits have written the life of this extraordinary man; but the greatest part of these biographers seem more intent on advancing the glory of their founder, than solicitous about the truth and fidelity of their relations; and hence the most common events, and the most trivial actions, that concern *IGNATIUS*, are converted into prodigies and miracles. The history of this enterprising fanatic has been composed with equal truth and ingenuity, though seasoned with a

The nature of
the order and in-
stitution of the
Jesuits.

The HISTORY of the Roman or Latin CHURCH. SECT. III.

stituting such an order as the state of the church at that time essentially required [w].

XI. The Jesuits hold a middle rank between the *monks*, and the *secular clerks*, and, with respect to the nature of their institute, approach nearer to the *regular canons* than to any other order. For though they resemble the monks in this, that they live separate from the multitude and are bound by certain religious vows, yet they are exempt from stated hours of worship, and other numerous and burthensome services that lie heavy upon the Monastic orders; that they may have more time to employ in the education of youth, in directing the consciences of the faithful, in edifying the church by their pious and learned productions, and in transacting other matters, that relate to the prosperity of the papal hierarchy. Their whole order is divided into three classes. The first comprehends the *professed members*, who live in what are called the *professed houses*; the second contains the *scholars*, who instruct the youth in the *colleges*; and to the third belong the *novices*, who live in the *houses of probation* [x]. The *professed members*, besides the three ordinary vows of *poverty*, *chastity*, and *obedience*, that are common to all the Monastic tribes, are obliged to take a fourth, by which they solemnly bind themselves *to go without deliberation or delay wherever the pope shall think fit to send them*; they are also a kind of *Mendicants*, being without any fixed subsistence, and living upon the liberality of pious and well-disposed people. The other *Jesuits*, and more particularly the *scholars*, are possessed of large revenues, and are obliged, in case of urgent necessity, to contribute to the support of the *professed members*. These latter, who are few in number (considering the multitudes that belong to the other classes) are, generally speaking, men of prudence and learning, deeply skilled in the affairs of the

very large portion of wit and pleasantry, by a French writer, who calls himself HERCULES RASIEL DE SELVE*. This work, which is divided into two volumes, is entituled, *Histoire de l'admirable Don Inigo de Guipuscoa, Chevalier de la Vierge, et fondateur de la Monarchie des Inquistes*, and it has passed already through two editions at the Hague.

[w] Not only the protestants, but also a great number of the more learned and judicious Roman-catholics have unanimously denied that IGNATIUS LOYOLA had either learning sufficient to compose the writings of which he is said to be the author, or genius enough to form the society of which he is considered as the founder. They maintain, on the contrary, that he was no more than a flexible instrument in the hands of able and ingenious men, who made use of his fortitude and fanaticism to answer their purposes; and that persons much more learned than he, were employed to compose the writings which bear his name. See GERDES, *Miscellaneous Tracts*, vol. iii. p. 429.—The greatest part of his works are supposed to have proceeded from the pen of his secretary JOHN DE PALANCO; see LA CROZE *Histoire du Christianisme en Ethiopie*, p. 55. 271. The Benedictines affirm, that his book of *Spiritual Exercises* is copied from the work of a Spanish Benedictine monk, whose name was CISNEROS, (see *La Vie de M. de la Croze, par JORDAN*) and the *Constitutions* of the Society were probably the work of LAINEZ and SALMERON, two learned men, who were among its first members. See *Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. i. p. 115.

[x] Other writers add a fourth class, consisting of the *Spiritual and Temporal Coadjutors*, who assist the professed members, and perform the same functions, without being bound by any more than the three *simple vows*; though after a long and approved exercise of their employment, the *Spiritual Coadjutors* are admitted to the *fourth vow*, and thus become *professed members*.]

[* This is a feigned name. The real author was Monsieur LE VIRE, an ingenious bookseller, who lived formerly at the Hague.]

world,

world, and dexterous in transacting all kinds of business from long experience added to their natural penetration and sagacity; in a word, they are the true and perfect Jesuits. The rest have, indeed, the title, but are rather the companions and assistants of the *Jesuits*, than real members of that mysterious order; and it is only in a very vague and general sense, that the denomination of *Jesuits* can be applied to them. But, what is still more remarkable, the secrets of the society are, not revealed even to all the *professed members*. It is only a small number of this class, whom old age has enriched with thorough experience, and long trial declared worthy of such an important trust, that are instructed in the mysteries of the order.

The zeal of the Jesuits for the interests of the Roman pontif.

XII. The church and court of *Rome*, since the remarkable period when so many kingdoms and provinces withdrew from their jurisdiction, have derived more influence and support from the labours of this single order, than from all their other emissaries and ministers, and all the various exertions of their power and opulence. It was this famous company, which, spreading itself with an astonishing rapidity through the greatest part of the habitable world, confirmed the wavering nations in the faith of *Rome*, restrained the progress of the rising sects, gained over a prodigious number of Pagans in the most barbarous and remote parts of the globe to the profession of popery, and attacked the pretended heretics of all denominations; appearing almost alone in the field of controversy, sustaining with fortitude and resolution the whole burthen of this religious war, and surpassing, by far, the champions of antiquity both in the subtilty of their reasonings and the eloquence of their discourses. Nor is this all; for by the affected softness and complying spirit that reigns in their conversation and manners, by their consummate skill and prudence in civil transactions, by their acquaintance with the arts and sciences, and a variety of other qualities and accomplishments, they insinuated themselves into the peculiar favour and protection of statesmen, persons of the first distinction, and even of crowned heads. Nor did any thing contribute more to give them that ascendancy they have universally acquired, than the cunning and dexterity with which they relaxed and modified their system of morality, accommodating it artfully to the propensities of mankind, and depriving it, on certain occasions, of that severity, that rendered it burthensome to the sensual and voluptuous. By this they supplanted, in the palaces of the great, and in the courts of princes, the Dominicans and other rigid doctors, who had formerly held there the tribunal of confession and the direction of consciences, and engrossed to themselves an exclusive and irresistible influence in those retreats of royal grandeur, from whence issue the counsels that govern mankind [y]. An order of this nature could not but be highly adapted to promote the interests of the court of *Rome*; and this, indeed, was its great end, and the leading purpose which it never lost sight of; employing every where its utmost vigilance and art to

[y] Before the order of *Jesuits* was instituted, the Dominicans alone directed the consciences of all the European kings and princes. And it was by the *Jesuits* that the Dominicans were deprived of a privilege so precious to spiritual ambition. See PEYRAT, *Antiquités de la Chapelle de France*, LIV. I. p. 322.

support

support the authority of the Roman pontiffs, and to save them from the contempt, of which they must have been naturally apprehensive in consequence of a revolution that opened the eyes of a great part of mankind.

All these circumstances placed the order of Jesuits in a conspicuous point of light. Their capacity, their influence, and their zeal for the papacy, had a very advantageous retrospect upon themselves, as it swelled the sources of their opulence, and procured to their society an uncommon and indeed an excessive degree of veneration and respect. But it is also true, that these signal honours and advantages exposed them, at the same time, to the envy of other religious orders; that their enemies multiplied from day to day; and that they were often involved in the greatest perplexities and perils. Monks, courtiers, civil magistrates, public schools united their efforts to crush this rising fabric of ambition and policy; and a prodigious number of books were published to prove that nothing could be more detrimental to the interests of religion and the well-being of society, than the institution of the Jesuits. In France, Poland, and other countries, they were declared public enemies of their country, traitors and parricides, and were even banished with ignominy [2]. But the prudence, or rather the cunning and artifice, of the disciples of Loyola, calmed this storm of opposition, and, by gentle and imperceptible methods, restored the credit and authority of their order, delivered it from the perils with which it had been threatened, and even put it in a state of defence against the future attempts of its adversaries [a].

[2] See the *Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. iii. passim. — Boulayr, *III*. Académ. Paris. tom. vi. p. 559—648, & passim. As well as almost all the writers who have given accounts of the sixteenth century.

[a] The character and spirit of the Jesuits were admirably described, and their transactions and fate foretold with a sagacity almost prophetic, so early as the year 1551, in a sermon preached in Christ Church, Dublin, by Dr. GEORGE BROWN, bishop of that see; a copy of which was given to Sir JAMES WARE, and may be found in the *Harleian Miscellany* (vol. v. p. 566). The remarkable passage that relates to the Jesuits is as follows:—"But there are a new fraternity of late sprung up, who call themselves *Jesuits*, which will deceive many, who are much after the Scribes and Pharisees' manner. Amongst the *Jews* they shall strive to abolish the truth, and shall come very near to do it. For these sorts will turn themselves into several forms; with the Heathens a Heathenist, with the Atheists an Atheist, with the Jews a Jew, with the Reformers a Reformade, purposely to know your intentions, your minds, your hearts, and your inclinations. and thereby bring you, at last, to be like the fool that said, in his heart, there was no God. These shall spread over the whole world, shall be admitted into the councils of princes, and they never the wiser; charming of them, yea, making your princes reveal their hearts and the secrets therein, and yet they not perceive it; which will happen from falling from the law of God, by neglect of fulfilling the law of God; and by winking at their sins; yet, in the end, God, to justify his law, shall suddenly cut off this society, even by the hands of those who have most succoured them, and made use of them; so that, at the end, they shall become odious to all nations. They shall be worse than *Jews*, having no resting place upon earth, and then shall a Jew have more favour than a *Jesuit*."—This singular passage, I had almost said prediction, seems to be accomplished, in part, by the present suppression of the Jesuits in France (I write this note in the year 1762) and by the universal indignation, which the perfidious stratagems, iniquitous avarice, and ambitious views of that society, have excited among all the orders of the French nation from the throne to the cottage.]

XIII. The pontiffs of this century that ruled the church, after the decease of ALEXANDER VI, were PIUS III, JULIUS II [b], LEO X, ADRIAN VI, whose characters and transactions have been already taken notice of, CLEMENT VII, of the house of *Medicis*,—PAUL III, of the illustrious family of *Farnese* [c],—JULIUS III [d], whose name was JOHN MARIA GIOCCI,—MARCELLUS II,—PAUL IV [e], whose name, before his elevation to the pontificate, was JOHN PETER CARAFFA,—PIUS IV, who was ambitious of being looked upon as a branch of the house of *Medicis*, and who had been known, before his promotion, by the name of JOHN ANGELI DE MEDICIS,—PIUS V, a Dominican, called MICHAEL GHISLERI, a man of an austere and melancholy turn of mind, by which, and other similar qualities, he obtained a place in the Kalendar, GREGORY XIII, who was known previously by the name of HUGO BUONCOMPAGNO [f], SIXTUS V, otherwise named FELIX PERETTI DI MONTALTO, who, in pride, magnificence, intrepidity, and strength of mind, and in other great virtues and vices, surpassed by far all his predecessors,—URBAN VIII, GREGORY XIV, INNOCENT IX, the shortness of whose reigns prevented them from acquiring reputation, or falling into reproach.

Among these pontiffs there were better and worse [g]; but they were, all, men of exemplary characters, when compared with the greatest part of those,

[b] It was from a foolish ambition of resembling CÆSAR (a very singular model for a Christian pontiff) that this pope, whose name was ROVERE, assumed the denomination of JULIUS II. It may be, indeed, said, that CÆSAR was sovereign pontiff (*pontifex maximus*), and that the pope of Rome enjoyed the same dignity, though with some change in the title.]

[c] The sentiments and character of PAUL III have given rise to much debate, even in our time, especially between the late Cardinal QUIRINI, and KEISLING, SCHELHORN, and some other writers. The cardinal has used his utmost efforts to defend the probity and merit of this pontiff; while the two learned men above mentioned represent him as a perfidious politician, whose predominant qualities were dissimulation and fraud. See QUIRINUS, *De gestis PAULI III, Farnesii*. Brixia 1745, in 4^{to}.—[Among the *res gestæ* of PAUL III were two illegitimate children, whose off-spring, *Farnese* and *Sforza*, were made cardinals in their infancy. See KEISLINGII *Epistola de gestis PAULI III*.—SCHELHORN. *Amenitatis Histor. Eccles. et Liter.*]

[d] This was the worthy pontiff, who was scarcely seated in the papal chair, when he bestowed the cardinal's hat on the keeper of his monkeys, a boy chosen from among the lowest of the populace, and who was also the infamous object of his unnatural pleasures. See THUAN. lib. vi. & xv.—HOFFING. *Hist. Eccl.* tom. v. p. 572.—and more especially SLEIDAN, *Hist.* lib. xxi. Folio, m. 609.—When JULIUS was reproached by the cardinals for introducing such an unworthy member into the sacred college, a person who had neither learning, nor virtue, nor merit of any kind, he impudently replied by asking them, *What virtue or merit they had found in him, that could induce them to place him (JULIUS) in the papal chair?*

[e] Nothing could exceed the arrogance and ambition of this violent and impetuous pontiff, as appears from his treatment of QUEEN ELIZABETH. See BURNET'S *History of the Reformation*.—It was he, who, by a bull, pretended to raise Ireland to the privilege and quality of an independent kingdom; and it was he also, who first instituted the *Index of prohibited books*, mentioned above § IX.]

[f] See JO. PETR. MAFFEI *Annales Gregorii XIII, Rom.* 1742, in 4^{to}.

[g] PIUS V and SIXTUS V made a much greater figure in the Annals of Fame, than the other pontiffs here mentioned; the former on account of his excessive severity against hereticks and the famous bull in *Obsequium Domini*, which is read publicly at Rome every year on the Festival of the Holy Sacrament; and the latter in consequence of many services rendered to the church and numberless attempts, carried on with spirit, fortitude, generosity, and perseverance, to promote its glory and maintain its authority.—Several modern writers employed their pens in describing the life and

CENT. XVI. who governed the church before the reformation. The number of adversaries, both foreign and domestic, that arose to set limits to the despotism of *Rome*, and to call in question the authority and jurisdiction of its pontif, rendered the college of cardinals and the Roman nobility more cautious and circumspect in the choice of a spiritual ruler; nor did they almost dare, in these critical circumstances of opposition and danger, to entrust such an important dignity to any ecclesiastic, whose bare-faced licentiousness, frontless arrogance, or inconsiderate youth might render him peculiarly obnoxious to reproach, and furnish, thereby, new matter of censure to their adversaries. It is also worthy of observation, that from this period of opposition, occasioned by the ministry of the reformers, the Roman pontiffs have never pretended to such an exclusive authority, as they had formerly usurped; nor could they, indeed, make good such pretensions, were they so extravagant as to avow them. They claim, therefore, no longer a power of deciding, by their single authority, matters of the highest moment and importance; but, for the most part, pronounce according to the sentiments that prevail in the college of cardinals, and in the different congregations, which are intrusted with their respective parts in the government of the church. Nor do they any more venture to foment divisions in sovereign states, to arm subjects against their rulers, or to level the thunder of their excommunications at the heads of princes. All such proceedings, which were formerly so frequent at the court of *Rome*, have been prudently suspended since the gradual decline of that ignorance and superstition that prescribed a blind obedience to the pontif, and the new degrees of power and authority that monarchs and other civil rulers have gained by the revolutions that have shaken the papal throne.

The state of the clergy.

XIV. That part of the body of the clergy, that is more peculiarly devoted to the Roman pontiffs, seemed to have undergone no visible change during this century. As to the bishops, it is certain, that they made several zealous attempts, and some even in the council of *Trent*, for the recovery of the ancient rights and privileges, of which they had been forcibly deprived by the popes. They were even persuaded that the pope might be lawfully obliged to acknowledge, that the episcopal dignity was of divine original, and that the bishops received their authority immediately from CHRIST himself [b]. But all these attempts were successfully opposed by the artifice and dexterity of the court of *Rome*, which never ceases to propagate and enforce this despotic maxim: "That the bishops are no more than the legates or ministers of Christ's vicar; and that the authority they exercise is entirely derived from the munificence and favour of the apostolic see." a maxim, however, that several bishops, and more especially those of *France*, treat with

actions of PIUS V, so soon as they saw him canonised, in the year 1712, by CLEMENT XI. Of his bull, entitled, *In Coena Domini*, and the tumults it occasioned, there is an ample account in GIANNONE'S *Histoire Civile de Naples*, tom. iv. p. 248. The life of SIXTUS V has been written by GREGORY LETI, and translated into several languages; it is, however, a very indifferent work, and the relations it contains are, in many places, inaccurate and unfaithful.

[b] See PAOLO SARPI'S *History of the Council of Trent*.

little respect. Some advantages, however, and those not inconsiderable, CENT. XVI. were obtained for the clergy at the expence of the pontifs; for those *reservations, provisions, exemptions, and expectatives* (as they are termed by the Roman lawyers) which before the reformation had excited such heavy and bitter complaints throughout all *Europe*, and exhibited the clearest proofs of papal avarice and tyranny, were now almost totally suppressed.

XV. Among the subjects of deliberation in the council of *Trent*, the reformation of the lives and manners of the clergy, and the suppression of the scandalous vices, that had too long reigned in that order, were not forgot; nay, several wise and prudent laws were enacted with a view to that important object. But those, who had the cause of virtue at heart, complained (and the reason of these complaints still subsists) that these laws were no more than feeble precepts, without any avenging arm to maintain their authority, and that they were transgressed, with impunity, by the clergy of all ranks, and, particularly, by those who filled the higher stations and dignities of the church. In reality, if we cast our eyes upon the Romish clergy, even in the present time, these complaints will appear as well founded now, as they were in the sixteenth century. In *Germany*, as is notorious to daily observation, the bishops, if we except their habit, their title, and a few ceremonies that distinguish them, have nothing, in their manner of living, that is, in the least, adapted to point out the nature of their sacred office. In other countries a great part of the episcopal order, unmolested by the remonstrances, or reproofs, of the Roman pontif, pass their days amidst the pleasures and cabals of courts, and appear rather the slaves of temporal princes, than the servants of him *whose kingdom is not of this world*. They court glory; they aspire after riches, while very few employ their time and labours in edifying their people, or in promoting among them the vital spirit of practical religion and substantial virtue. Nay, what is still more deplorable, those bishops, who, sensible of the sanctity of their character and the duties of their office, distinguish themselves by their zeal in the cause of virtue and good morals, are frequently exposed to the malicious efforts of envy, often loaded with false accusations, and involved in perplexities of various kinds. It may, indeed, be partly owing to the examples they have received, and still, too often, receive, from the heads of the church, that so many of the bishops live dissolved in the arms of luxury, or toiling in the service of ambition. Many of them, perhaps, would have been more attentive to their vocation, and more exemplary in their manners, had they not been corrupted by the models exhibited to them by the bishops of *Rome*, and had constantly before their eyes a splendid succession of popes and cardinals, remarkable only for their luxury and avarice, their arrogance and vindictive spirit, their voluptuousness and vanity.

The lives and morals of the clergy.

That part of the clergy, that go under the denomination of *canons*, continue, almost every where, their antient course of life, and consume, in a manner far remote from piety and virtue, the treasures which the religious zeal and liberality of their ancestors had consecrated to the uses of the church and the relief of the poor.

CENT. XVI.

It must not, however, be imagined, that all the other orders of the clergy are at liberty to follow such corrupt models, or, indeed, that their inclinations and reigning habits tend towards such a loose and voluptuous manner of living. For it is certain, that the reformation had a manifest influence, even upon the Roman-catholic clergy, by rendering them, at least, more circumspect and cautious in their external conduct, that they might be thus less obnoxious to the censures of their adversaries; and it is accordingly well known, that since that period the clergy of the inferior orders have been more attentive to the rules of outward decency, and have given less offence by open and scandalous vices and excesses, than they had formerly done.

Monks. —
the ancient orders
reformed.

XVI. The same observation holds good with respect to the Monastic orders. There are, indeed, several things, worthy of the severest animadversion, chargeable upon many of the heads and rulers of these societies; nor are these societies, themselves, entirely exempt from that laziness, intemperance, ignorance, artifice, discord, and voluptuousness, that were, formerly, the common and reigning vices in the Monastic retreats. It would be, nevertheless, an instance of great partiality and injustice to deny, that in many countries the manner of living, among these religious orders, has been considerably reformed, severe rules employed to restrain licentiousness, and much pains taken to conceal, at least, any vestiges of ancient corruption and irregularity that may yet remain. In some places, the austerity of the ancient rules of discipline, which had been so shamefully relaxed, was restored by several zealous patrons of Monastic devotion; while others, animated with the same zeal, instituted new communities, in order to promote, as they piously imagined, a spirit of religion, and thus to contribute to the well-being of the church.

Of this latter number was MATTHEW DE BASSI, a native of *Italy*, the extent of whose capacity was much inferior to the goodness of his intentions, and who was a Franciscan of the more rigid class [*i*], who were zealous in observing rigorously the primitive rules of their institution. This honest enthusiast seriously persuaded himself, that he was divinely inspired with the zeal that impelled him to restore the original and genuine rules of the Franciscan order to their primitive austerity; and, looking upon this violent and irresistible impulse as a celestial commission attended with sufficient authority, he set himself to this work of Monastic reformation with the most devout assiduity and ardor [*k*]. His enterprize was honoured, in the year 1525, with the solemn approbation of CLEMENT VII; and this was the origin of the order of *Capuchins*. The vows of this order implied the greatest contempt of the world and its enjoyments, and the most profound humility

[*i*] The dispute, that arose among the Franciscans by INNOCENT IV's relaxing so far their institute as to allow of *property* and *possessions* in their community, produced a division of the order into two classes, of which the most considerable who adopted the papal relaxation were denominated *Conventuals*, and the other, who rejected it, *Brethren of the Observance*. The latter professed to *observe* and follow rigorously the primitive laws and institute of their founder.]

[*k*] The *Brethren of the Observance*, mentioned in the preceding note, had degenerated, in process of time, from their primitive self-denial; and hence the reforming spirit that animated BASSI, accompanied

accompanied with the most austere and sullen gravity of external aspect [l]; and its reputation and success excited, in the other Franciscans, the most bitter feelings of indignation and envy [m]. The *Capuchins* were so called from the sharp pointed *Capuche*, or Cowl [n], which they added to the ordinary Franciscan habit, and which is supposed to have been used by St. FRANCIS himself as a covering for his head [o].

Another branch of the Franciscan order formed a new community under the denomination of *Recollets* in France, *Reformed Franciscans* in Italy, and *Bare-footed Franciscans* in Spain, and were erected into a separate order with their respective laws and rules of discipline, in the year 1532, by the authority of CLEMENT VII. They differ from the other Franciscans in this only, that they profess to follow, with greater zeal and exactness, the austere institute of their common founder and chief; and hence also they were called *Friars Minors of the strict observance* [p].

St. THERESA, a Spanish lady of an illustrious family, undertook the difficult task of reforming the Carmelite order [q], which had departed much from its primitive sanctity, and of restoring its neglected and violated laws to their original credit and authority. Her associate, in this arduous attempt, was JOHANNES DE SANTA CRUSA, and her enterprize was not wholly destitute of success, notwithstanding the opposition she met with from the greatest part of the *Carmelites*. Hence the order was, during the space of ten years, divided into two branches, of which one followed a milder rule of discipline, while the other embraced an institute of the most severe and self-denying kind [r]. But, as these different rules of life among the members of the same community were a perpetual source of animosity and discord, the more austere or *bare-footed Carmelites* were separated from the others, and formed into a distinct body, in the year 1580, by GREGORY XIII, at the particular desire of PHILIP II, king of Spain. This separation was confirmed, in the year 1587, by SIXTUS V, and compleated, in 1593, by CLEMENT VIII, who allowed the *bare-footed Carmelites* to have their own

[l] See LUC. WADDINGI *Annales Ordinis Minorum*, tom. xvi. p. 207. 257. Edit. Roman.—HELLOT, *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques*, tom. vii. ch. xxiv. p. 264.—And above all, ZACH. BOVERI *Annales Capucinatorum*.

[m] One of the circumstances that exasperated most the Franciscans, was the innovation made in their habit by the *Capuchins*. Whatever was the cause of their choler, true it is, that their provincial persecuted the new monks, and obliged them to fly from place to place, until they, at last, took refuge in the palace of the duke of Camerino, by whose credit they were received under the obedience of the *Conventuals*, in the quality of *hermits minors*, in the year 1527. The next year the pope approved this union, and confirmed to them the privilege of wearing the square *capuche*; and thus the order was established in 1528.]

[n] I know not, on what authority the learned MICHAEL GEDDES attributes the erection and denomination of this order to one FRANCIS PUCHINE.]

[o] See DU FRESNE, *Glossarium Latinitat. Medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 298. Edit. Bened.

[p] See WADDINGI *Annales*, tom. xvi. p. 167.—HELLOT, *Histoire des Ordres Monast.* tom. vii. ch. xviii. p. 129.

[q] Otherwise called the *White Fryars*.

[r] The former, who were the *Carmelites of the ancient observance*, were called the *moderate* or *mitigated*; while the latter, who were of the *strict observance*, were distinguished by the denomination of *bare-footed Carmelites*.]

CENT. XVI. chief, or *general*. But, after having withdrawn themselves from the others, these austere friars quarrelled among themselves, and in a few years their dissensions grew to an intolerable height; hence they were divided anew, by the pontif last mentioned, into two communities, each of which were governed by their respective *general* [s].

New Monastic
orders.

XVII. The most eminent of all the new orders that were instituted in this century, was, beyond all doubt, that of the *Jesuits*, which we have already had occasion to mention in speaking of the chief pillars of the church of *Rome*, and the principal supports of the declining authority of its pontifs. Compared with this aspiring and formidable society, all the other religious orders appear inconsiderable and obscure. The reformation, among the other changes which it occasioned, even in the Roman church, by exciting the circumspection and emulation of those who still remained addicted to popery, gave rise to various communities, which were all comprehended under the general denomination of *Regular Clerks*. And as all these communities were, according to their own solemn declarations, formed with a design of imitating that sanctity of manners, and reviving that spirit of piety and virtue, that had distinguished the sacred order in the primitive times; this was a plain, though tacit, confession of the present corruption of the clergy, and consequently of the indispensable necessity of the reformation.

The first society of these regular clerks was formed in the year 1524, under the denomination of *Theatins*, which they derived from their principal founder JOHN PETER CARAFFA (then bishop of *Theate*, or *Chieti*, in the kingdom of *Naples*, and afterwards pope, under the title of PAUL IV) who was assisted, in this pious undertaking, by CAJETAN or GAETAN, and other devout associates. These monks, being by their vows destitute of all possessions and revenues, and even secluded from the resource of begging, subsist entirely upon the voluntary liberality of pious persons. They are called by their profession and institute to revive a spirit of devotion, to purify and reform the eloquence of the pulpit, to assist the sick and the dying by their spiritual instructions and counsels, and to combat heretics of all denominations with zeal and assiduity [t]. There are also some female convents established under the rule and title of this order.

The establishment of the *Theatins* was followed by that of the *Regular Clerks of St. Paul*, so called from their having chosen that apostle for their patron; though they are more commonly known under the denomination of *Barnabites*, from the church of St. BARNABAS, at *Milan*, which was bestowed upon them in the year 1545. This order, which was approved by CLEMENT VII, and confirmed, about three years after, by PAUL III, was originally founded by ANTONIO MAVIA ZACHARIAS of *Cremona*, and BARTHOLOMEW FERRARI, and JACOB. ANT. MORIGIA, noblemen of *Milan*. Its members were at first obliged to live after the manner of the *Theatins*, re-

[s] HELYOT, *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. i. ch. xlvii. p. 340.

[t] HELYOT, *ibid.* tom. iv. ch. xii. p. 71.

nouncing all worldly goods and possessions, and depending upon the spontaneous donations of the liberal for their daily subsistence. But they grew soon weary of this precarious method of living from hand to mouth, and therefore took the liberty, in process of time, of securing to their community certain possessions and stated revenues. Their principal function is to go from place to place, like the apostles, in order to convert sinners, and bring back transgressors into the paths of repentance and obedience [u].

The *Regular Clerks of St. Maioul*, who are also called *the fathers of Somasquo*, from the place where their community was first established, and which was also the residence of their founder, were erected into a distinct society by JEROM ÆMILIANI, a noble Venetian, and were afterwards successively confirmed, in the years 1540 and 1543, by the Roman pontiffs PAUL III and PIUS IV [w]. Their chief occupation was to instruct the ignorant, and, particularly, young persons, in the principles and precepts of the Christian religion, and to procure assistance for those that were reduced to the unhappy condition of orphans. The same important ministry was committed to the *fathers of the Christian doctrine* in France and Italy. The order that bore this title in France was instituted by CÆSAR DE BUS, and confirmed, in the year 1597, by CLEMENT VIII; while that, which is known in Italy under the same denomination, derives its origin from MARK CUSANI, a Milanese knight, and was established by the approbation and authority of PIUS V and GREGORY XIII.

XVIII. It would be an endless and, indeed, an unprofitable labour to enumerate particularly that prodigious multitude of less considerable orders and religious associations, that were instituted in Germany and other countries, from an apprehension of the pretended heretics, who disturbed, by their innovations, the peace, or rather the lethargy, of the church. For certainly no age produced such a swarm of monks, and such a number of convents, as that in which LUTHER and the other reformers opposed the divine light and power of the gospel to ignorance, superstition, and papal tyranny. We therefore pass over in silence these less important establishments, of which many have been long buried in oblivion, because they were erected on unstable foundations, while numbers have been suppressed by the wisdom of certain pontiffs, who have considered the multitude of these communities rather as prejudicial than advantageous to the church. Nor can we take particular notice of the female convents, or nunneries, among which the *Ursulines* shine forth with a superior lustre both in point of number and dignity. The *Priests of the Oratory* founded in Italy by PHILIP NERI, a native of Florence, and publicly honoured with the protection of GREGORY XIII, in the year 1577, must, however, be excepted from this general silence, on account of the eminent figure they have made in the republic of letters. It was this community that produced BARONIUS, RAYNALDUS,

Other new religious communities.

[u] HELYOT *loc. cit.* tom. iv. ch. xvi. p. 100.—In the same part of this incomparable work, this learned author gives a most accurate, ample, and interesting account of the other religious orders, which are here, for brevity's sake, but barely mentioned.

[w] *Acta Sanctor. Februar.* tom. ii. p. 217.

and

CENT. XVI. and LADDERONIUS, who hold so high a rank among the ecclesiastical historians of the sixteenth and following centuries; and there are still to be found in it men of considerable erudition and capacity. The name of this religious society was derived from an apartment, accommodated in the form of an Oratory [x], or cabinet for devotion, which St. PHILIP NERI built at Florence for himself, and in which for many years he held spiritual conferences with his more intimate companions [y].

The state of
learning.

XIX. It is too evident to admit of the least dispute, that all kinds of erudition, whether sacred or profane, were held in much higher esteem in the western world since the time of LUTHER, than they had been before that auspicious period. The Jesuits, more especially, boast, and perhaps not without reason, that their society contribute more, at least in this century, to the culture of the languages, the improvement of the arts, and the advancement of true science, than all the rest of the religious orders. It is certain, that the schools and academies, either through indolence or design, persisted obstinately in their ancient method of teaching, though that method was intricate and disagreeable in many respects; nor would they suffer themselves to be better informed, or permit the least change in their uncouth and disgusting systems. The monks were not more remarkable for their docility than the schools; nor did they seem at all disposed to admit into the retreats of their gloomy cloisters a more solid and elegant method of instruction, than they had been formerly accustomed to. These facts furnish a rational account of the surprizing variety that appears in the style and manner of the writers of this age; of whom several express their sentiments with elegance, perspicuity, and order, while the diction of a great part of their contemporaries is barbarous, perplexed, obscure, and insipid.

CÆSAR BARONIUS, already mentioned, undertook to throw light on the history of religion by his annals of the christian church; but his pretended light was scarcely any thing better than perplexity and darkness [z]. His example, however, excited many to enterprises of the same nature. The attempts of the persons, they called heretics, rendered indeed such enterprises necessary. For these heretics, with the learned FLAECIUS and CHEMNITZ at their head [a], demonstrated with the utmost evidence, that not only the declarations of holy scripture, but also the testimony of ancient

[x] HELYOT, *Hist. des Ordres*, &c. tom. viii. ch. iv. p. 12.

[y] He was peculiarly assisted in these conferences by BARONIUS, author of the *Ecclesiastical Annals*, who also succeeded him as general of the order, and whose *Annals*, on account of his imperfect knowledge of the Greek language, are so remarkably full of gross faults, misrepresentations, and blunders.]

[z] The learned ISAAC CASAUBON undertook a refutation of the *Annals* of BARONIUS in an excellent work, entitled, *Exercitationes*, &c. and though he carried it no farther down than the 34th year of the Christian era, yet he pointed out a prodigious number of palpable and (many of them) shameful errors, into which the Romish annalist has fallen during that short space. Even the Roman-catholic *Literati* acknowledge the inaccuracies and faults of BARONIUS; hence many learned men, such as PAGI, NORIS, and TILLEMONT, have been employed to correct them. And accordingly a few years ago a new edition of these *Annals* was published at Lucca, with the corrections of these reviewers at the foot of each page.]

[a] The former in the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses*; the latter in his *Examen Concilii Tridentini*.

history, and the records of the primitive church, were in direct opposition both CENT. XVI to the doctrines and pretensions of the church of *Rome*. This was wounding popery with its own arms and attacking it in its pretended strong holds. It was, therefore, incumbent upon the friends of *Rome* to employ, while it was time, their most zealous efforts in maintaining the credit of those ancient fables, on which the greatest part of the papal authority reposed, as its only foundation and support.

XX. Several men of genius in *France* and *Italy*, who have been already mentioned with the esteem that is due to their valuable labours [b], used their most zealous endeavours to reform the barbarous philosophy of the times. But the excessive attachment of the scholastic doctors to the Aristotelian philosophy on the one hand, and, on the other, the timorous prudence of many weak minds, who were apprehensive that the liberty of striking out new discoveries and ways of thinking might be prejudicial to the church, and open a new source of division and discord; crushed all these generous endeavours, and rendered them ineffectual. The throne of the subtle Stagirite remained therefore unshaken; and his philosophy, whose very obscurity afforded a certain gloomy kind of pleasure, and flattered the pride of those who were implicitly supposed to understand it, reigned unrivalled in the schools and monasteries. It even acquired new credit and authority from the Jesuits, who taught it in their colleges, and made use of it in their writings and disputes. By this, however, these artful ecclesiastics shewed evidently, that the captious jargon and subtilties of that intricate philosophy was much more adapted to puzzle heretics, and to give the popish doctors, at least, the appearance of carrying on the controversy with success, than the plain and obvious method of disputing, which is pointed out by the genuine and unbiassed dictates of right reason.

The state of philosophy.

XXI. The church of *Rome* produced, in this century, a prodigious number of theological writers. The most eminent of these, both in point of reputation and merit, are as follow: THOMAS DE VIO, otherwise named cardinal CAJETAN, — ECKIUS, — CHOCLÆUS, — EMSER, — SURIUS, — HOSIUS, — FABER, — SADOLET, — PIGHIUS, — Vatable, — CANUS, D'ESPENCE, — CARANZA, — MALDONAT, — TURRIANUS, — ARIAS MONTANUS, — CATHARINUS, — REGINALD POLE, — SIXTUS SENENSIS, — CASSANDER, — PAYA D'ANDRADA, — BAIUS, — PAMELIUS, and others [c].

Theological writers of the Romish persuasion.

XXII. The religion of *Rome*, which the pontifs are so desirous of imposing upon the faith of all that bear the Christian name, is derived, according to the unanimous accounts of its doctors, from two sources, the *written word of God*, and the *un-written*; or, in other words, from *scripture* and *tradition*. But as the most eminent divines of that church are far from being agreed concerning the person or persons, who are authorized to

The principles of the Roman catholic faith.

[b] See above, SECT. II. VIII, and IX.

[c] For an ample account of the literary character, rank, and writings of these learned men, and of several others whose names are here omitted, see LOUIS ELL DU PIN, *Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, tom. xiv. & xvi.

CENT. XVI. interpret the declarations of these two oracles, and to determine their sense; so it may be asserted with truth, that there is, as yet, no possibility of knowing, with certainty, what are the real doctrines of the church of *Rome*, nor where, in that communion, the judge of religious controversies is to be found. It is true, the court of *Rome*, and all those who favour the despotic pretensions of its pontif, maintain that he alone, who governs the church as CHRIST's vice-gerent, is entitled to explain and determine the sense of *scripture* and *tradition* in matters pertaining to salvation, and that, of consequence, a devout and unlimited obedience is due to his decisions. To give weight to this opinion, Pius IV formed the plan of a council, which was afterwards instituted and confirmed by SIXTUS V, and called the *Congregation for interpreting the decrees of the council of Trent*. This congregation was authorized to examine and decide, in the name of the pope, all matters of small moment relating to ecclesiastical discipline, while every debate of any consequence, and, particularly, all disquisitions concerning points of faith and doctrine, were left to the decision of the pontif alone, as the great oracle of the church[d]. But notwithstanding all this, it was impossible to persuade the wiser part of the Roman catholic body to acknowledge this exclusive authority in their head. And accordingly, the greatest part of the Gallican church, and a considerable number of very learned men of the popish religion in other countries, think very differently from the court of *Rome* on this subject. They maintain, that all bishops and doctors have a right to consult the sacred fountains of *scripture* and *tradition*, and to draw from thence the rules of faith and manners for themselves and their flock; and that all difficult points and debates of consequence are to be referred to the cognizance and decision of general councils. Such is the difference of opinion (with respect to the determination of doctrine and controversies) that still divides the church of *Rome*; and as no judge has been, nor perhaps can be found, to compose it, we may, therefore, reasonably despair of seeing the religion of *Rome* acquire a permanent, stable, and determined form.

The council of
Trent.

XXIII. The council of *Trent* was assembled, as was pretended, to correct, illustrate, and fix with perspicuity, the doctrine of the church, to restore the vigour of its discipline, and to reform the lives of its ministers. But in the opinion of those, who examine things with impartiality, this assembly; instead of reforming ancient abuses, rather gave rise to new enormities; and many transactions of this council have excited the just complaints of the wisest men in both communions. They complain that many of the opinions of the scholastic doctors on intricate points (that had formerly been left undecided, and had been wisely permitted as subjects of free debate) were, by this council, absurdly adopted as articles of faith, and recommended

[d] See *AYMON, Tableau de la Cour de Rome*, part V. ch. iv. p. 282. [Hence it was that the approbation of INNOCENT XI was refused to the artful and insidious work of BOSSUET, bishop of *Meaux*, entitled, *An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church*, until the author had suppressed entirely the first edition of that work, and made considerable corrections and alterations in the second.]

as such, nay imposed, with violence, upon the consciences of the people CENT. XVI
 under pain of excommunication. They complain of the ambiguity that reigns in the decrees and declarations of that council, by which the disputes and dissensions, that had formerly rent the church, instead of being removed by clear definitions and wise and charitable decisions, were rendered, on the contrary, more perplexed and intricate, and were, in reality, propagated and multiplied instead of being suppressed or diminished. Nor were these the only reasons of complaint; for it must have been afflicting to those that had the cause of true religion and Christian liberty at heart, to see all things decided, in that assembly, according to the despotic will of the Roman pontif, without any regard to the dictates of truth, or the authority of scripture, its genuine and authentic source, and to see the assembled fathers reduced to silence by the Roman legates, and deprived, by these insolent representatives of the papacy, of that influence and credit, that might have rendered them capable of healing the wounds of the church. It was, moreover, a grievance justly to be complained of, that the few wise and pious regulations, that were made in that council, were never supported by the authority of the church, but were suffered to degenerate into a mere lifeless form or shadow of law, which was treated with indifference and transgressed with impunity. To sum up all in one word, the most candid and impartial observers of things consider the council of *Trent* as an assembly that was more attentive to what might maintain the despotic authority of the pontif, than solicitous about entering into the measures that were necessary to promote the good of the church. It will not therefore appear surprizing, that there are certain doctors of the Romish church, who, instead of submitting to the decisions of the council of *Trent*, as an ultimate rule of faith, maintain, on the contrary, that these decisions are to be explained by the dictates of *scripture* and the language of *tradition*. Nor, when all these things were duly considered, shall we have reason to wonder that this council has not throughout the same degree of credit and authority, even in those countries, that profess the Roman catholic religion [e].

Some countries, indeed, such as *Germany*, *Poland*, and *Italy*, have adopted *implicitly* and *absolutely* the decrees of this council, without the smallest restriction of any kind. But in other places it has been received and acknowledged on certain conditions, which modify, not a little, its pretended authority. Among these latter we may reckon the Spanish dominions, which disputed, during many years, the authority of this council, and acknowledged it, at length, only so far as it could be adopted *without any prejudice to the rights and prerogatives of the kings of Spain* [f]. In other countries, such as *France* [g] and *Hungary* [h], it never has been solemnly

[(e) The translator has here inserted into the text the note [b] of the original, and has thrown the citations it contains into different notes.]

[f] See GIANNONE, *Histoire Civile du Royaume de Naples*, tom. iv. p. 235.

[g] See HECT. GODOFR. MASII *Diff. de Contemtu Concilii Tridentini in Gallia*, which is published among his other dissertations collected into one volume. See also the excellent discourse,

CENT. XVI. received or publicly acknowledged. It is true indeed, that, in the former of these kingdoms, those decrees of *Trent*, that relate to points of religious doctrine, have, *tacitly* and *imperceptibly*, through the power of custom, acquired the force and authority of a rule of faith; but those which regard external discipline, spiritual power, and ecclesiastical government, have been constantly rejected, both in a public and private manner, as inconsistent with the authority and prerogatives of the throne, and prejudicial to the rights and liberties of the Gallican church [i].

The principal heads of the Roman-catholic religion.

XXIV. Notwithstanding all this, such as are desirous of forming some notion of the religion of *Rome*, will do well to consult the decrees of the council of *Trent*, together with the compendious *confession of faith*, which was drawn up by the order of Pius IV. Those however, who expect to derive, from these sources, a clear, compleat, and perfect knowledge of the Romish faith, will be greatly disappointed. To evince the truth of this assertion it might be observed, as has been already hinted, that, both in the decrees of *Trent* and in this papal confession, many things are expressed in a vague and ambiguous manner, and that designedly, on account of the intestine divisions and warm debates that then reigned in the church. This other singular circumstance might also be added, that several tenets are omitted in both, which no Roman catholic is allowed to deny, or even to call in question. But, waving both these considerations, let it only be observed, that in these decrees and in this confession several doctrines and rules of worship are inculcated in a much more rational and decent manner, than that in which they appear in the daily service of the church, and in the public practice of its members [k]. Hence we may conclude, that the justest notion of the doctrine of *Rome* is not to be derived so much from the terms, made use of in the decrees of the council of *Trent*, as from the *real signification* of these terms, which must be drawn from the customs, institutions, and observances, that are, every where, in use in the Romish church. Add to all this, another consideration, which is, that in the bulls issued out from the papal throne in these latter times, certain doctrines, which were obscurely proposed in the council of *Trent*, have been explained with sufficient perspicuity, and avowed without either hesitation or reserve. Of this CLE-

which Dr. COURRAYER has subjoined to the second volume of his French translation of PAUL SARPI's *History of the Council of Trent*, entitled, *Discours sur la Reception du Concile de Trente, particulièrement en France*, p. 775. 789.

[b] See LORANDI SAMUELOF, *Vita Andr. Dudithii*, p. 56.

[i] See LOD. ELL. DU PIN, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, tom. xv. p. 380.

[For what relates to the Literary History of the Council of Trent, the historians that have transmitted accounts of it, and other circumstances of that nature, see JO. CHR. KOCHERI *Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolica*, p. 325. 377: as also SALIG's *History of the Council of Trent* (in German), p. 190—320.]

[(k) This is true, in a more especial manner, with respect to the canons of the council of *Trent* relating to the doctrine of purgatory, the invocation of saints, the worship of images and relics. The terms employed in these canons are artfully chosen so as to avoid the imputation of idolatry, in the philosophical sense of that word; for in the scripture-sense they cannot avoid it, as all use of images in religious worship is expressly forbidden in the sacred writings in many places. But this circumspection does not appear in the worship of the Roman-catholics, which is notoriously idolatrous in both the senses of that word.]

MENT XI gave a notorious example in the famous *bull*, called UNIGENITUS, CENT. XVI. which was an enterprize as audacious, as it proved unsuccessful.

XXV. As soon as the popes perceived the remarkable detriment their authority had suffered from the accurate interpretations of the holy scriptures, that had been given by the learned, and the perusal of these divine oracles, which was now grown more common among the people, they left no methods unemployed that might discourage the culture of this most important branch of sacred erudition. While the tide of resentment ran high, they forgot themselves in the most unaccountable manner. They permitted their champions to indulge themselves openly in reflexions injurious to the dignity of the sacred writings, and, by an excess of blasphemy almost incredible (if the passions of men did not render them capable of the greatest enormities) to declare publicly, that the edicts of the pontifs and the records of oral tradition were superior, in point of authority, to the express language of the holy scriptures. But as it was impossible to bring the sacred writings wholly into disrepute, they took the most effectual methods, in their power, to render them obscure and useless. For this purpose the ancient Latin translation of the Bible, commonly called the *Vulgate* [l], though it abounds with innumerable gross errors, and, in a great number of places, exhibits the most shocking barbarity of style, and the most impenetrable obscurity with respect to the sense of the inspired writers, was declared, by a solemn decree of the council of *Trent*, an *authentic*, i. e. a *faithful, accurate, and perfect* [m] translation, and was consequently recommended as a production beyond the reach of criticism or censure. It was easy to foresee that such a declaration was every way adapted to keep the people in ignorance, and to veil from their understandings the true meaning of the sacred writings. In the same council farther steps were taken to execute, with success, the designs of *Rome*. A severe and intolerable law was enacted, with respect to all interpreters and expositors of the scriptures, by which they were forbidden to explain the sense of these divine books, *in matters relating to faith and practice*, in such a manner, as to make them speak a different language from that of the church and the ancient doctors. The same law farther declared, that the *church* alone (i. e. its ruler, the Roman pontif) had the right of determining the true meaning and signification of scripture. To fill up the measure of these tyrannical and iniquitous proceedings, the church of *Rome* persisted obstinately in affirming, though not always with the same impudence and plainness of speech, that the holy scriptures were not composed for the use of the multitude; but only for that of their spiritual teachers; and, of consequence,

The state of
exegetic theolo-
gy, or scripture-
knowledge.

[(l) This is a Latin translation of the Bible, compiled partly from the famous one of St. JEROME, and partly from the Old Italic Version. It was first published in the year 1590; but, being found to be full of errors, a second and more correct edition of it came out about two years after.]

[(m) If we consult the canons of the council of *Trent*, we shall find that the word *authentic*, is there explained in terms somewhat less strong and offensive than those used by Dr. MOSHEIM.]

CENT. XVI. ordered these divine records to be taken from the people in all places, where it was allowed to execute its imperious commands [n].

Commentators
and expositors of
the holy scrip-
tures.

XXVI. These circumstances had a visible influence upon the spirit and productions of the commentators and expositors of scripture, which the example of LUTHER and his followers had rendered, through emulation, extremely numerous. The popish doctors, who vied with the protestants in this branch of sacred erudition, were insipid, timorous, servilely attached to the glory and interests of the court of *Rome*, and discovered in their explications all the marks of slavish dependance and constraint. They seem to have been in constant terror lest any expression should escape from their pen, that favoured of opinions different from what were commonly received; they appeal, every moment, to the declarations and authority of the holy *fathers*, as they usually style them; nor do they appear to have so much consulted the real doctrines taught by the sacred writers, as the language and sentiments which the church of *Rome* has taken the liberty to put into their mouths. Several of these commentators rack their imaginations in order to force out of each passage of scripture the four kinds of significations, called *Literal*, *Allegorical*, *Tropological*, and *Anagogical*, which ignorance and superstition had first invented, and afterwards held so sacred in the explication of the inspired writings. Nor was their attachment to this manner of interpretation so ill imagined, since it enabled them to make the sacred writers speak the language that was favourable to the views of the church, and to draw out of the Bible, with the help of a little subtilty, whatever doctrine they had a mind to impose upon the credulity of the multitude.

It must, however, be acknowledged, that, besides these miserable commentators that dishonour the church of *Rome*, there were some in its communion, who had wisdom enough to despise these senseless methods of interpretation, and who, avoiding all mysterious significations and fancies, followed the plain, natural, and literal sense of the expressions used in the holy scriptures. In this class the most eminent were ERASMUS of *Rotterdam*, who translated into Latin, with an elegant and faithful simplicity, the books of the New Testament, and explained them with judgment in a paraphrase which is deservedly esteemed; Cardinal CAJETAN, who disputed with LUTHER at *Augsburg*, and who gave a brief, but judicious exposition of almost all the books of the Old and New Testament; FRANCIS TITELMAN, ISIDORUS CLARIUS, JOHN MALDONAT, BENEDICT JUSTINIAN, who acquired no mean reputation by their commentaries on the Epistles of St. *Paul*. To these may be added GAIGNY, D'ESPENCE, and other Expositors [o]. But these eminent men, whose example was so adapted to excite emulation, had almost no followers; and, in a short space of time, their

[n] The pontifs were not allowed to execute this despotic order in all countries that acknowledged the jurisdiction of the church of *Rome*. The French and some other nations have the Bible in their mother-tongue, in which they peruse it, though much against the will of the creatures of the pope.

[o] See SIMON, *Hist. Critique du Vieux, et de Nouv. Testament*.

influence was gone, and their labours were forgot. For, towards the conclusion of this century, EDMUND RICHER, that strenuous opposer of the encroachments made by the pontifs on the liberties of the Gallican church, was the only doctor in the university of *Paris*, who followed the literal sense and the plain and natural signification of the words of scripture; while all the other commentators and interpreters, imitating the pernicious example of several ancient expositors, were always racking their brains for mysterious and sublime significations, where none such were, nor could be designed by the sacred writers [p].

XXVII. The seminaries of learning were filled, before the reformation, with that subtle kind of theological doctors, commonly known under the denomination of *schoolmen*; so that even at *Paris*, which was considered as the principal seat of sacred erudition, no doctors were to be found, who were capable of disputing with the protestant divines in the method they generally pursued, which was that of proving the doctrines they maintained by arguments drawn from the Holy scriptures and the writings of the fathers. This uncommon scarcity of *didactic* and *scriptural* divines produced much confusion and perplexity, on many occasions, even in the council of *Trent*; where the scholastic doctors fatigued some, and almost turned the heads of others, by examining and explaining the doctrines that were there proposed, according to the intricate and ambiguous rules of their captious philosophy. Hence it became absolutely necessary to reform the methods of proceeding in theological disquisitions, and to restore to its former credit that which drew the truths of religion more from the dictates of the sacred writings and from the sentiments of the ancient doctors, than from the uncertain suggestions of human reason, and the ingenious conjectures of philosophy [q]. It was, however, impossible to deprive entirely the scholastic divines of the ascendant they had acquired in the seminaries of learning, and had so long maintained almost without opposition. Nay, after having been threatened with a diminution of their authority, they seemed to resume

The state of
didactic theology.

[p] See BAILLET, *Vie d'Edmund Richer*, p. 9, 10.

[q] See DU BOULAY's account of the Reformation of the Theological Faculty, or College at *Paris*, in his *Hist. Acad. Paris* tom. vii. p. 790. In this reform the Bachelors of Divinity, called *Sententarii* and *Biblici*, are particularly distinguished; and (what is extremely remarkable) the *Augustine* monks, who were LUTHER's fraternity, are ordered to furnish the college of divinity once a year with a *scriptural Bachelor* (*Baccalaureum Biblicum præsentare*); from whence we may conclude, that the monks of the *Augustine* order, to which LUTHER belonged, were much more conversant in the study of the Holy Scriptures than the other Monastic societies. But this academical law deserves to be quoted here at length, and that so much the more as DU BOULAY's History is in few hands. It is as follows: *Augustinenses quolibet anno Biblicum præsentabunt secundum statutum fol. 21. quod sequitur: Quilibet Ordo Mendicantium et Collegium S. Bernardi habeat quolibet anno Biblicum qui legat ordinariè, alioqui priventur Baccalaureo sententiariorum.* It appears by this law, that each of the Mendicant orders was, by a decree of the Theological Faculty, obliged to furnish, yearly, a *scriptural Bachelor*, (such was LUTHER); and yet we see that in the Reformation already mentioned this obligation is imposed upon none but the *Augustine* monks; from which it is natural to conclude, that the Dominicans, Franciscans, and the other Mendicants, had entirely neglected the study of the Scriptures, and, consequently, had among them no *scriptural Bachelors*, and that the *Augustine* monks alone were in a condition to satisfy the demands of the Theological Faculty.

CENT. XVI. new vigour from the time that the Jesuits adopted their philosophy, and made use of their subtile dialectic, as a more effectual armour against the attacks of the heretics, than either the language of scripture, or the authority of the fathers. And, indeed, this intricate jargon of the schools was every way proper to answer the purposes of a set of men, who found it necessary to puzzle and perplex, where they could neither refute with perspicuity, nor prove with evidence. Thus they artfully concealed their defeat, and retreated, in the dazzled eyes of the multitude, with the appearance of victory. [r].

The Mystics lost, almost, all their credit in the church of *Rome* after the reformation; and that, partly, on account of the favourable reception they found among the protestants, and, partly, in consequence of their pacific system, which, giving them an aversion to controversy in general, rendered them little disposed to defend the papal cause against its numerous and formidable adversaries. These enthusiasts however were, in some measure, tolerated in the church of *Rome*, and allowed to indulge themselves in their philosophical speculations, on certain conditions, which obliged them to abstain from censuring either the laws or the corruptions of the church, and from declaiming, with their usual freedom and vehemence, against the vanity of external worship, and the dissensions of jarring and contentious doctors.

The state of
morality and
practical religion.

XXVIII. There was no successful attempt made, in this century, to correct or improve the practical or moral system of doctrine that was followed in the church of *Rome*; nor, indeed, could any make such an attempt without drawing upon him the displeasure, and perhaps the fury of the papal hierarchy. For, in reality, such a project of reformation seemed in no wise conducive to the interests of the church, as these interests were understood by its ambitious and rapacious rulers. And it is undoubtedly certain, that many doctrines and regulations, on which the power, opulence, and grandeur of that church essentially depended, would have run the risk of falling into discredit and contempt, if the pure and rational system of morality, contained in the gospel, had been exhibited, in its native beauty and simplicity, to the view and perusal of all Christians without distinction. Little or no zeal was therefore exerted in amending or improving the doctrines that immediately relate to practice. On the contrary, many persons of eminent piety and integrity, in the communion of *Rome*, have grievously complained (with what justice shall be shewn in its proper place [s]), that, as soon as the Jesuits had gained an ascendant in the courts of princes and in the schools of learning, the cause of virtue began visibly to decline. It has been alledged, more particularly, that this artful order employed all the force of their subtile distinctions to sap the foundations of morality, and, in process of time, opened a door to all sorts of licentiousness and iniquity by the loose and dissolute rules of conduct they propagated as

[(r) The translator has added the two last sentences of this paragraph, to illustrate more fully the sense of the author.]

[(s) See CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I. CHAP. I. § XXXIV.]

far as their influence extended. This poisonous doctrine spread, indeed, its contagion, in a latent manner, during the sixteenth century; but, in the following age, its abettors ventured to expose some specimens of its turpitude to public view, and thus gave occasion to great commotions in several parts of Europe.

All the moral writers of the Romish church, in this century, may be distinguished into three classes, the *School-men*, the *Dogmatists* [t], and the *Mystics*. The first explained, or rather obscured, the virtues and duties of the Christian life, by knotty distinctions, and unintelligible forms of speech, and buried them under an enormous load of arguments and demonstrations. The second illustrated them from the declarations of scripture and the opinions of the ancient doctors. While the third placed the whole of morality in the tranquillity of a mind, withdrawn from all sensible objects, and habitually employed in the contemplation of the divine nature.

XXIX. The number of combatants that the pontiffs brought into the field of controversy, during this century, was prodigious, and their glaring defects are abundantly known. It may be said, with truth, of the most of them, that, like many warriors of another class, they generally lost sight of all considerations, except those of victory and plunder. The disputants, which the order of Jesuits sent forth in great number, against the adversaries of the church of Rome, surpassed all the rest in subtilty, impudence, and invective. But the chief leader and champion of the polemic tribe was ROBERT BELLARMINE, a Jesuit, and one of the college of cardinals, who treated, in several bulky volumes, of all the controversies that subsisted between the protestants and the church of Rome, and whose merit as a writer consisted, principally, in clearness of style and a certain copiousness of argument, which shewed a rich and fruitful imagination. This eminent defender of the church of Rome arose about the conclusion of this century, and, on his first appearance, all the force and attacks of the most illustrious protestant doctors were turned against him alone. His candor and plain-dealing exposed him, however, to the censures of several divines of his own communion; for he collected, with diligence, the reasons and objections of his adversaries, and proposed them, for the most part, in their full force, with integrity and exactness. Had he been less remarkable on account of his fidelity and industry; had he taken care to select the weakest arguments of his antagonists, and to render them still weaker, by proposing them in an imperfect and unfaithful light, his fame would have been much greater among the friends of Rome, than it actually is [u].

The state of religious controversy.

XXX. If we turn our view to the internal state of the church of Rome, and consider the respective sentiments, opinions, and manners of its different members, we shall find that, notwithstanding its boasted unity of faith,

The controversies that divide the church of Rome.

[(t). The reader will easily perceive by the short account of these three classes, that is given by Dr. MOSHEIM, that the word *Dogmatist* must not be taken in that *magisterial* sense, which it bears in modern language.]

[u] See JO. FRID. MAYERI *Elogia de fide Baronii et Bellarmini ipsi pontificis dubia*, published at Amsterdam in 8vo in 1698.

CENT. XVI. and its ostentatious pretensions to harmony and concord, it was, in this century, and is, at this day, divided and distracted with dissensions and contests of various kinds. The Franciscans and the Dominicans contend with vehemence about several points of doctrine and discipline. The Scotists and Thomists are at eternal war. The bishops have never ceased disputing with the pontif (and the congregations that he has instituted to maintain his pretensions) concerning the origin and limits of his authority and jurisdiction. The French and Flemings, together with other countries, openly oppose the Roman pontif on many occasions, and refuse to acknowledge his supreme and unlimited dominion in the church; while, on the other hand, he still continues to encroach upon their privileges, sometimes with violence and resolution, when he can do so with impunity, at other times, with circumspection and prudence, when vigorous measures appear dangerous or unnecessary. The Jesuits, who, from their first rise, had formed the project of diminishing the credit and influence of all the other religious orders, used their warmest endeavours to share with the Benedictines and other monasteries, which were richly endowed, a part of their opulence; and their endeavours were crowned with success. Thus they drew upon their society the indignation and vengeance of the other religious communities, and armed against it the monks of every other denomination; and, in a more especial manner, the Benedictines and Dominicans, who surpassed all its enemies in the keenness and bitterness of their resentment. The rage of the Benedictines is animated by a painful reflection on the possessions of which they had been deprived; while the Dominicans contend for the honour of their order, the privileges annexed to it, and the religious tenets by which it is distinguished. Nor are the theological colleges and seminaries of learning more exempt from the flame of controversy than the clerical and monastic orders; on the contrary, debates concerning almost all the doctrines of Christianity are multiplied in them beyond number, and conducted with little moderation. It is true, indeed, that all these contests are tempered and managed by the prudence and authority of the Roman pontifs in such a manner as to prevent their being carried to an excessive height, to a length that might prove fatal to the church, by destroying that phantom of external unity that is the source of its consistence, as an ecclesiastical body. I say *tempered* and *managed*; for to heal entirely these divisions, and calm these animosities, however it may be judged an undertaking worthy of one, who calls himself the *Vicar of Christ*, is, nevertheless, a work beyond the power, and contrary to the intention, of the Roman pontif.

The more momentous controversies that have divided the church of Rome.

XXXI. Besides these debates of inferior moment, which made only a slight breach in the tranquillity and union of the church of *Rome*, there arose, after the period in which the council of *Trent* was assembled, controversies of much greater importance, which deservedly attracted the attention of Christians of all denominations. These controversies were set on foot by the Jesuits, and from small beginnings have encreased gradually and gathered strength, so that the flame they produced has been transmitted even to our

our times, and continues, at this very day, to divide the members of the CENT. XVI. Romish church in a manner that does not a little endanger its stability. While the Roman pontiffs foment perhaps, instead of endeavouring to extinguish, the less momentous disputes mentioned above, they observe a different conduct with respect to those now under consideration. The most zealous efforts of artifice and authority are constantly employed to calm the contending parties (since it appears impossible to unite and reconcile them) and to diminish the violence of commotions which they can scarcely ever hope entirely to suppress. Their efforts, however, have hitherto been, and still continue to be, ineffectual. They have not even been able to calm the agitation and vehemence with which these debates are carried on, nor to inspire any sentiments of moderation and mutual forbearance into minds, which are less animated by the love of truth, than by the spirit of faction.

XXXII. Whoever looks with attention and impartiality into these controversies will easily perceive, that there are two parties in the Roman church, whose notions with respect both to doctrine and discipline are extremely different. The Jesuits, in general, considered as a body [w], maintain, with the greatest zeal and obstinacy, the ancient system of doctrine and manners, which was universally adopted in the church before the rise of LUTHER, and which, though absurd and ill-digested, has, nevertheless, been considered as highly favourable to the views of Rome, and the grandeur of its pontiffs. Two general classes of doctors in the church of Rome. These sagacious ecclesiastics, whose peculiar office it is to watch for the security and defence of the papal throne, are fully persuaded that the authority of the pontiffs, as well as the opulence, pomp, and grandeur of the clergy, depend entirely upon the preservation of the ancient forms of doctrine; and that every project that tends either to remove these forms, or even to correct them, must be, in the highest degree, detrimental to, what they call, the interests of the church, and gradually bring on its ruin. On the other hand, there are within the pale of the Roman church, especially since the dawn of the reformation, many pious and well-meaning men, whose eyes have been opened, by the perusal of the inspired and primitive writers, upon the corruptions and defects of the received forms of doctrine and discipline. Comparing the dictates of primitive Christianity with the vulgar system of popery, they have found the latter full of enormities, and have always been desirous of a reformation (though, indeed, a partial one, according to their particular fancies) that thus the church might be purified from those unhappy abuses, that have given rise to such fatal divisions, and still draw upon it the censures and reproaches of the heretics.

From these opposite ways of thinking arose naturally the warmest contentions and debates between the Jesuits and several doctors of the church of Rome. These debates may be reduced under the six following heads: The main controversies that divide the church of Rome reduced to six heads.

The First subject of debate concerns the *limits and extent of the power and jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff*. The Jesuits, with their numerous tribe of First subject of debate.

[w] The Jesuits are here taken in the general and collective sense of that denomination; because there are several individuals of that order, whose sentiments differ from those that generally prevail in their community.]

CENT. XVI. followers and dependents, all maintain, that the pope is *infallible*;—that he is the only visible source of that universal and unlimited power, which CHRIST has granted to the church;—that all bishops and subordinate rulers derive from him alone the authority and jurisdiction with which they are invested;—that he is not bound by any laws of the church, nor by any decrees of the councils that compose it;—and that he alone is the supreme law-giver of that sacred community, a law-giver whose edicts and commands it is in the highest degree criminal to oppose or disobey. Such are the strange sentiments of the Jesuits; but they are very far from being universally adopted. For other doctors of the church of Rome hold, on the contrary, that the pope is liable to error;—that his authority is inferior to that of a general council;—that he is bound to obey the commands of the church, and its laws, as they are enacted in the councils that represent it;—that these councils have a right to depose him from the papal chair, when he abuses, in a flagrant manner, the dignity and prerogatives with which he is intrusted;—and, that in consequence of these principles, the bishops and other inferior rulers and doctors derive the authority that is annexed to their respective dignities, not from the Roman pontiff, but from CHRIST himself.

Second subject of debate.

XXXIII. The *extent and prerogatives of the church* form the *Second subject of debate*. The Jesuits and their adherents stretch out its borders far and wide. They comprehend within its large circuit, not only many who live separate from the communion of Rome [x], but even extend the inheritance of eternal salvation to nations that have not the least knowledge of the Christian religion, or of its divine author, and consider as true members of the church open transgressors which profess its doctrines. But the adversaries of the Jesuits reduce within narrower limits the kingdom of CHRIST, and not only exclude from all hope of salvation, those who are not within the pale of the church of Rome, but also those who, though they live within its eternal communion, yet dishonour their profession by a vicious and profligate course of life. The Jesuits, moreover, not to mention other differences of less moment, assert, that the church can never pronounce an erroneous or unjust decision, either relating to *matters of fact*, or *points of doctrine* [y]; while the adverse party declare, that, in judging of matters of fact, it is not secured against all possibility of erring.

[(x)] They were accused at *Spoleto*, in the year 1653, of having maintained, in their public instructions there, the probability of the salvation of many heretics. See LE CLERC, *Biblioth. Univers. et Historique*, tom. xiv. p. 320.]

[(y)] This distinction, with respect to the *objects* of infallibility, was chiefly owing to the following historical circumstance: Pope INNOCENT X condemned *five propositions* drawn from the famous book of JANSENIUS, entitled, *Augustinus*. This condemnation occasioned the two following questions: 1st, Whether or no these propositions were erroneous? This was the question *de jure*, i. e. as the translator has rendered it, the question *relating to doctrine*. 2^d, Whether or no these propositions were really taught by JANSENIUS? This was the question *de facto*, i. e. relating to the matter of fact. The church was supposed, by some, infallible only in deciding questions of the former kind.]

XXXIV. The *Third* class of controversies, that divides the church of CENT. XVI. Rome, comprehends the debates relating to the *nature, efficacy, and necessity of divine grace*, together with those that concern *original sin*, the *natural power* of man to obey the laws of God, the *nature and foundation* of those *eternal decrees* that have for their object the salvation of men. The Dominicans, Augustins, and Jansenists, with several other doctors of the church, adopt the following propositions: That the *impulse* of divine grace cannot be *opposed* or *resisted*;—that there are no *remains of purity or goodness* in human nature since its fall;—that the *eternal decrees* of God, relating to the salvation of men, are neither founded upon, nor attended with, any condition whatsoever;—that God wills the salvation of all mankind, and several other tenets that are connected with these. The Jesuits maintain, on the contrary, that the *natural dominion* of sin in the human mind, and the hidden corruption it has produced in our internal frame, are less *universal and dreadful*, than they are represented by the doctors now mentioned;—that *human nature* is far from being deprived of *all power* of doing good;—that the *succours of grace* are administered to *all mankind* in a measure *sufficient* to lead them to eternal life and salvation;—that the *operations* of grace offer no violence to the faculties and powers of nature, and therefore may be *resisted*;—and that God from all eternity has appointed everlasting rewards and punishments, as the portion of men in a future world, not by an *absolute, arbitrary, and unconditional* decree, but in consequence of that divine and unlimited *prescience*, by which he foresaw the *actions, merits, and characters* of every individual.

The third subject of debate.

XXXV. The *Fourth* head, in this division of the controversies that destroy the pretended unity of the church of Rome, contains various subjects of debate, relative to *doctrines of morality and rules of practice*, which it would be both tedious and foreign from our purpose to enumerate in a circumstantial manner; though it may not be improper to touch lightly the first principles of this endless controversy [z].

The fourth subject of debate.

The Jesuits and their followers have inculcated a very strange doctrine with respect to the motives, that determine the moral conduct and actions of men. They represent it as a matter of perfect indifference, from what motives men obey the laws of God, provided these laws are really obeyed; and maintain, that the service of those who obey from the fear of punish-

[z] No author has given a more accurate, precise, and clear enumeration of the objections that have been made to the moral doctrine of the Jesuits, and the reproaches that have been cast on their rules of life, and none at the same time has defended their cause with more art and dexterity, than the eloquent and ingenious GABRIEL DANIEL (a famous member of their order) in a piece, entitled, *Entretiens de Cleandre et d'Eudoxe*. This dialogue is to be found in the first volume of his *Opuscles*, p. 351. and was designed as an answer to the celebrated *Provincial Letters* of PASCAL, which did more real prejudice to the society of the Jesuits than can be well imagined, and exposed their loose and perfidious system of morals with the greatest fidelity and perspicuity, embellished by the most exquisite strokes of humour and irony. Father DANIEL, in the piece abovementioned, treats with great acuteness the famous doctrine of *probability*, p. 351; the method of *directing our intentions*, p. 556; *equivocation*, and *mental reservation*, p. 562; *sins of ignorance and oblivion*, p. 719; and it must be acknowledged, that, if the cause of the Jesuits were susceptible of defence or plausibility, it has found in this writer an able and dexterous champion.

ment

CENT. XVI. ment is as agreeable to the Deity, as those actions which proceed from a principle of love to him and to his laws. This decision excites the horror of the greatest part of the doctors of the Roman church, who affirm, that no acts of obedience that do not proceed from the love of God, can be acceptable to that pure and holy Being. Nor is the doctrine of the Jesuits only chargeable with the corrupt tenets already mentioned. They maintain farther, that a man never sins, properly speaking, but when he transgresseth a divine law, which is *fully known* to him, which is *present to his mind* while he acts, and of which he *understands the true meaning* and intent. And they conclude from hence, that, in strict justice, the conduct of that transgressor cannot be looked upon as criminal, who is either ignorant of the law, or is in doubt about its true signification, or loses sight of it through forgetfulness, at the time that he violates it. From these propositions they deduce the famous doctrine of *probability* and *philosophical sin*, that have cast an eternal reproach upon the schools of the Jesuits [a]. Their adversaries behold these pernicious tenets with the utmost abhorrence, and assert that neither ignorance, nor forgetfulness of the law, nor the doubts that may be entertained with respect to its signification, will be admitted as sufficient to justify transgressors before the tribunal of God. This contest, about the main and fundamental points of morality, has given rise to a great variety of debates concerning the duties we owe to God, our neighbour, and ourselves, and produced two sects of moral doctors, whose animosities and divisions have miserably rent the church of *Rome* in all parts of the world, and involved it in the greatest perplexities.

The fifth subject
of debate.

XXXVI. The administration of the sacraments, especially those of *penance* and the *eucharist*, forms the *Fifth* subject of controversy in the church of *Rome*. The Jesuits and many other doctors are of opinion, that the salutary effects of the sacraments are produced by their *intrinsic virtue* and *immediate operation* [b] upon the mind at the time they are administered, and that consequently it requires but little preparation to receive them to edification and comfort; nor do they think that God requires a mind adorned

[(a) The doctrine of *probability* consists in this: That an opinion or precept may be followed with a good conscience, when it is inculcated by four, or three, or two, nay even by one doctor of any considerable reputation, even though it be contrary to the judgment of him that follows it, and even of him that recommends it. This doctrine rendered the Jesuits capable of accommodating themselves to all the different passions of men, and to persons of all tempers and characters, from the most austere to the most licentious.—*Philosophical sin*, according to the Jesuits doctrine, is an action, or course of actions, that is repugnant to the dictates of reason, and yet not offensive to the Deity. See a fuller account of these two odious doctrines, in the following part of this work, CENT. XVII. SECT. II. PART I. § XXXIV. and in the author's and translator's notes.]

[(b) This is the only expression that occurred to the translator, as proper to render the true sense of that phrase of the scholastic divines, who say, that the sacraments produce their effect *opere operato*. The Jesuits and Dominicans maintain, that the sacraments have in themselves an *instrumental* and *efficient* power, by virtue of which they work in the soul (independently on its previous preparation or propensities) a disposition to receive the divine grace; and this is what is commonly called the *opus operatum* of the sacraments. Thus, according to their doctrine, neither knowledge, wisdom, humility, faith, nor devotion, are necessary to the efficacy of the sacraments, whose victorious energy nothing but a mortal sin can resist. See Dr. COURRAYER's *Translation of PAUL SARPI's History of the Council of Trent*, tom. i. livr. ii. p. 423, 424, edit. Amsterdam.]

with inward purity and a heart filled with divine love, in order to the obtaining of the ends and purposes of these religious institutions. And hence it is, that, according to their doctrine, the priests are empowered to give immediate absolution to all such as confess their transgressions and crimes, and afterwards to admit them to the use of the sacraments. But such sentiments are rejected with indignation by all those of the Romish communion, who have the progress of vital and practical religion truly at heart. These look upon it as the duty of the clergy, to use the greatest diligence and assiduity in examining the characters, tempers, and actions of those who demand absolution and the use of the sacraments, before they grant their requests; since, in their sense of things, the real benefits of these institutions can extend to those only whose hearts are carefully purged from the corruptions of iniquity, and filled with that divine love, *that casteth out fear*. Hence arose that famous dispute in the church of Rome concerning a frequent approach to the holy communion, which was carried on with such warmth, in the last century, between the Jesuits and the Jansenists, with ARNAULD [c] at the head of the latter, and has been renewed in our times by the Jesuit PICHON, who thereby incurred the indignation of the greatest part of the French bishops [d]. The frequent celebration of the Lord's supper is one of the main duties which the Jesuits recommend with peculiar earnestness to those who are under their spiritual direction, representing it as the most certain and infallible method of appeasing the Deity, and obtaining from him the entire remission of their sins and transgressions. This manner of proceeding the Jansenists censure with their usual severity, and it is also condemned by many other learned and pious doctors of the Romish communion, who reject that *intrinsic virtue and efficient operation* that is attributed to the sacraments, and wisely maintain that the receiving the sacrament of the Lord's supper can be profitable to those only, whose minds are prepared by faith, repentance, and the love of God for that solemn service.

XXXVII. The *Sixth* and last controversy turns upon the proper method of instructing Christians in the truths and precepts of religion. One part of the Romish doctors, who have the progress of religion truly at heart, look upon it as expedient and even necessary to sow the seeds of divine truth in the mind, in the tender and flexible state of infancy, when it is most susceptible of good impressions, and to give it by degrees according to the measure of its capacity, a full and accurate knowledge of the doctrines and duties of religion. Others, who have a greater zeal for the interests of the church, than the improvement of its members, recommend a devout ignorance to such as submit to their direction, and think a Christian sufficiently instructed, when he has learned to yield a blind and unlimited obedience to the orders of the church. The former are of opinion, that nothing can be so profitable and instructive to Christians as the study of the Holy Scriptures, and consequently judge it highly expedient that they should be translated into

The sixth subject
of debate.

[c] ARNAULD published on this occasion his famous book concerning the *Practice of communicating frequently*. The French title is, *Traité de la frequente Communion*.

[d] See *Journal Universel*, tom. xiii. p. 148. tom. xv. p. 363. tom. xvi. p. 124.

CENT. XVI. the vulgar tongue of each country. The latter exclude the people from the satisfaction of consulting the sacred oracles of truth, and look upon all vernacular translations of the Bible as dangerous, and even of a pernicious tendency. They accordingly maintain, that it ought only to be published in a learned language, to prevent its instructions from becoming familiar to the multitude. The former compose pious and instructive books to nourish a spirit of devotion in the minds of Christians, to enlighten their ignorance and dispel their errors; they illustrate and explain the public prayers and the solemn acts of religion in the language of the people, and exhort all, who attend to their instructions, to peruse constantly these pious productions, in order to improve their knowledge, purify their affections, and to learn the method of worshiping the Deity in a rational and acceptable manner. All this, however, is highly displeasing to the latter kind of doctors, who are always apprehensive, that the blind obedience and implicit submission of the people will diminish in proportion as their views are enlarged and their knowledge increased [e].

The disputes carried on with Baius concerning grace, &c.

XXXVIII. All the controversies that have been here mentioned did not break out at the same time. The disputes concerning divine grace, the natural power of man to perform good actions, original sin, and predestination, which have been ranged under the third class, were publicly carried on in the century of which we are now writing. The others were conducted with more secrecy and reserve, and did not come forth to public view before the following age. Nor will this appear at all surprizing to those who consider that the controversies concerning *grace* and *free-will*, which had been set in motion by LUTHER, were neither accurately examined, nor peremptorily decided, in the church of Rome, but were rather artfully suspended and hushed into silence. The sentiments of LUTHER were indeed condemned; but no fixed and perspicuous rule of faith, with respect to

[e] The account here given of the more momentous controversies, that divide the church of Rome, may be confirmed, illustrated, and enlarged by consulting a multitude of books published in the last and present centuries, especially in France and Flanders, by Jansenists, Dominicans, Jesuits, and others. All the productions, in which the doctrine and precepts of the Jesuits and the other creatures of the Roman pontif are opposed and refuted, are enumerated by DOMINICK COLONIA, a French Jesuit, in a work published, in 1735, under the following title: *Bibliothèque Janseniste ou Catalogue Alphabetique des principaux livres Jansenistes, ou suspects de Jansenisme, avec des notes Critiques*. This writer is led into many absurdities by his extravagant attachment to the Roman pontif, and to the cause and tenets of his order. His book, however, is of use in pointing out the various controversies that perplex and divide the church of Rome. It was condemned by the late Pope BENEDICT XIV; but was, nevertheless, republished in a new form, with some change in the title, and additions that swelled it from one octavo volume to four of the same size. This new edition appeared at Antwerp in the year 1752, under the following title: *Dictionnaire des livres Jansenistes ou qui favorisent le Jansenisme à Anvers chez J. B. Verdussen*. And it must be acknowledged, that it is extremely useful in shewing the intestine divisions of the church, the particular contests that divide its doctors, the religious tenets of the Jesuits, and the numerous productions that relate to the six heads of controversy here mentioned. It must be observed, at the same time, that this work abounds with the most malignant invectives against many persons of eminent learning and piety, and with the most notorious instances of impartiality and injustice *.

[* See a particular account of this learned and scandalous work in the first and second volumes of the *Bibliothèque des Sciences et des Beaux Arts*, printed at the Hague.]

these disputed points, was substituted in their place. The decisions of St. CENT. XVI
 AUGUSTIN were solemnly approved; but the difference between these
 decisions and the sentiments of LUTHER was never clearly explained.
 The first rise of this fatal controversy was owing to the zeal of MICHAEL
 BAIUS, a doctor in the university of *Louvain*, equally remarkable on account
 of the warmth of his piety and the extent of his learning. This eminent
 divine, like the other followers of AUGUSTIN, had an invincible aversion to
 that contentious, subtle, and intricate manner of teaching theology that
 had long prevailed in the *schools*; and under the auspicious name of that
 famous prelate, who was his darling guide, he had the courage or temerity
 to condemn and censure, in an open and public manner, the tenets com-
 monly received in the church of *Rome* in relation to the *natural powers of*
man, and the *merit of good works*. This bold step drew upon BAIUS the
 indignation of some of his academical colleagues and the heavy censures of
 several Franciscan monks. Whether the Jesuits immediately joined in this
 opposition, and may be reckoned among the first accusers of BAIUS, is a
 matter unknown, or, at most, uncertain; but it is unquestionably evident
 and certain, that, even at the rise of this controversy, they abhorred the
 principal tenets of BAIUS, which he had taken from AUGUSTIN, and adopted
 as his own. In the year 1567, this doctor was accused at the court of
Rome, and *seventy-six propositions*, drawn from his writings, were condemned
 by pope PIUS V, in a circular letter expressly composed for that purpose.
 This condemnation, however, was issued out in an artful and insidious man-
 ner, without any mention being made of the name of the author; for the
 fatal consequences, that had arisen from the rash and inconsiderate measures
 employed by the court of *Rome* against LUTHER, were too fresh in the re-
 membrance of the prudent pontif to permit his falling into new blunders
 of the same nature. The thunder of excommunication was therefore
 suppressed by the dictates of prudence, and the person and functions of
 BAIUS were spared, while his tenets were censured. About thirteen years
 after this transaction, GREGORY XIII complied so far with the importunate
 solicitations of a Jesuit, named TOLET, as to reinforce the sentence of
 PIUS V by a new condemnation of the opinions of the Flemish doctor.
 BAIUS submitted to this new sentence, either from an apprehension that it
 would be followed by severer proceedings in case of resistance, or, which is
 more probable, on account of the ambiguity that reigned in the papal edict,
 and the vague and confused manner, in which the obnoxious propositions
 were therein expressed. But his example, in this respect, was not followed
 by the other doctors who had formed their theological system upon that of
 AUGUSTIN [f]; and, even at this day, many divines of the Romish com-
 munion, and particularly the Jansenists, declare openly that BAIUS was

[f] See, for an account of the disputes relating to BAIUS, the works of that author published
 in 4^{to} at *Cologne*, in 1696, particularly the second part or appendix, entitled, *Baiana, seu Scripta,*
quæ controversias spectant occasione sententiarum Baii exortas.—BAYLE'S *Diction.* at the article *BAIUS*,
 in which there is an ample and circumstantial account of these disputes.—DU PIN, *Bibliothèque des*
Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, tom. xvi. p. 144.—*Histoire de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. iii. p. 161.

CENT. XVI. unjustly treated, and that the two edicts of PRUS and GREGORY mentioned above are absolutely destitute of all authority, and have never been received as laws of the church [g].

Contests with the
Jesuits, Lessius,
and Hamelius.

XXXIX. Be that as it may, it is at least certain, that the doctrine of AUGUSTIN, with respect to the nature and operations of divine grace, lost none of its credit in consequence of these edicts, but was embraced and propagated with the same zeal as formerly, throughout all the Belgic provinces, and more especially in the two flourishing universities of *Louvain* and *Douay*. This appeared very soon after, when two Jesuits, named LESSIUS and HAMELIUS, ventured to represent the doctrine of predestination in a manner different from that, in which it appears in the writings of AUGUSTIN: For the sentiments of these Jesuits were publicly condemned by the doctors of *Louvain* in the year 1587, and by those of *Douay* the year following. The bishops of the Low countries were disposed to follow the example of these two universities, and had already deliberated about assembling a provincial council for this purpose, when the Roman pontif, SIXTUS V, suspended their proceedings by the interposition of his authority, and declared, that the cognizance and decision of religious controversies belonged only to the vicar of CHRIST, residing at *Rome*. But this cunning vicar, whose sagacity, prudence, and knowledge of men and things never failed him in transactions of this nature, wisely avoided making use of the privilege he claimed with such confidence, that he might not inflame the divisions and animosities that were already subsisting. And, accordingly, in the year 1588, this contest was finished, and the storm laid in such a manner, as that the contending parties were left in the quiet possession of their respective opinions, and solemnly prohibited from disputing either in public or in private upon the intricate points that had excited their divisions. Had the succeeding pontifs, instead of assuming the character of judges in this ambiguous and difficult controversy, imitated the prudence of SIXTUS V, and imposed silence on the litigious doctors, who renewed afterwards the debates concerning divine grace, the tranquillity and unity of the church of *Rome* would not have been interrupted by such violent divisions as rage at present in its bosom [b].

The controver-
sies with the
Molinists.

XL. The Roman church had scarcely perceived the fruits of that calm, which the prudence of SIXTUS had restored, by suppressing, instead of deciding, the late controversies, when new commotions of the same nature, but of a much more terrible aspect, arose to disturb its tranquillity. These

[g] This is demonstrated fully by an anonymous writer, in a piece, entitled, *Dissertation sur les Bulles contre Baius, où l'on montre qu'elles ne sont pas reçues par l'Eglise*, and published in two volumes 8^{vo} at *Utrecht*, in the year 1737.

[b] See *Apologie Historique des deux Censures de Louvain et de Douay*, par M. Gery, 1688, in 8^{vo}. The famous PASQUER QUENEL was the author of this apology, if we may give credit to the writer of a book, entitled, *Catechisme Historique et Dogmatique sur les Contestations de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 104.—See an account of this controversy in a piece, entitled, *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Controverses dans l'Eglise Romaine sur la Predestination et sur la Grace*; this curious piece is to be found in the fourteenth tome of LE CLERC'S *Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique*.

were

were occasioned by LEWIS MOLINA [i], a Spanish Jesuit, professor of CENT. XVI. divinity in the university of Eborā in Portugal, who, in the year 1588, published a book to shew that the operations of divine grace were entirely consistent with the freedom of the human will [k], and who introduced a new kind of hypothesis to remove the difficulties attending the doctrines of predestination and liberty, and to reconcile the jarring opinions of Augustinians, Thomists, Semi-Pelagians, and other contentious divines [l]. This attempt of the subtle Spanish doctor was so offensive to the Dominicans, who followed St. THOMAS as their theological guide, that they sounded, throughout the whole kingdom of Spain, the alarm of heresy, and accused the Jesuits of endeavouring to renew the errors of PELAGIUS. This alarm was followed by great commotions, and all things seemed to prognosticate a general flame, when CLEMENT VIII, in the year 1594, imposed silence on the contending parties, promising that he himself would examine with care and diligence every thing relating to this new debate, in order to decide it in such a manner, as might tend to promote the cause of truth and the peace of the church.

XLI. The pontif was persuaded that these gentle remedies would soon remove the disease, and that, through length of time, these heats and animosities would undoubtedly subside. But the event was far from being answerable to such pleasing hopes. The Dominicans, who had long fostered a deep-rooted and invincible hatred against the Jesuits, having now a favourable opportunity of venting their indignation, exhausted their furious zeal against the doctrine of MOLINA, notwithstanding the pacific orders of the papal edict. They fatigued incessantly the Spanish monarch, PHILIP II, and the Roman pontif, CLEMENT VIII, with their importunate clamours, until at length the latter found himself under a necessity of assembling at Rome a sort of council for the decision of this controversy. And thus commenced, about the beginning of the year 1598, those famous deliberations concerning the contests of the Jesuits and Dominicans; which were held in what was called the congregation *de auxiliis*, or of aids. This congregation

The congregation of aids.

[i] From this Spanish doctor's name proceeded the well-known denomination of *Molinists*, by which those Roman-catholics are distinguished, who seem to incline to the doctrines of grace and free-will, that are maintained in opposition to those of AUGUSTINE. Many, however, who differ widely from the sentiments of MOLINA, are unjustly ranked in the class of Molinists.

[k] The title of this famous book is as follows: *Liberi Arbitrii Concordia cum Gratiae donis, divinae praescientia, providentia, praedestinatione, et reprobatione, auctore Lud. Molina*. This book was first published at Lisbon in folio, in the year 1588.—Afterwards, with additions, and in 4^{to}, at Antwerp, Lyons, Venice, and other places, in 1595.—A third edition, still farther augmented, was published at Antwerp in 1609.

[l] MOLINA affirmed, that the Decree of predestination to eternal glory was founded upon a previous knowledge and consideration of the merits of the elect; that the grace, from whose operation these merits are derived, is not efficacious by its own intrinsic power only, but also by the consent of our own will, and because it is administered in those circumstances in which the Deity, by that branch of his knowledge, which is called *Scientia Media*, foresees that it will be efficacious. The kind of prescience, denominated in the schools *Scientia Media*, is that foreknowledge of future contingents, that arises from an acquaintance with the nature and faculties of rational beings, of the circumstances in which they shall be placed, of the objects that shall be presented to them, and of the influence that these circumstances and objects must have on their actions.]

CENT. XVI. was so denominated on account of the principal point in debate, which was the efficacy of the aids and succours of divine grace, and its consultations were directed by LEWIS MADRUSI, bishop of *Trent*, and one of the college of cardinals, who sat as president in this assembly, which was composed besides of three bishops and seven divines chosen out of so many different orders. The remaining part of this century was wholly employed by these spiritual judges in hearing and weighing the arguments alledged in favour of their respective opinions by the contending parties [m]. The Dominicans maintained, with the greatest obstinacy, the doctrine of their patron St. THOMAS, as alone conformable to truth. The Jesuits, on the other hand, though they did not adopt the religious tenets of MOLINA, thought the honour of their order concerned in this controversy on account of the opposition so publicly made to one of its members, and consequently used their utmost endeavours to have the Spanish doctor acquitted of the charge of Pelagianism, and declared free from any errors of moment. In this they acted according to the true Monastic spirit, which leads each order to resent the affronts that are offered to any of its members, as if they had been cast upon the whole community, and to maintain, at all adventures, the cause of every individual monk, as if the interests of the society were involved in it.

Rites and ceremonies.

XLII. Notwithstanding the zealous attempts that were made, by several persons of eminent piety, to restore the institutions of public worship to their primitive simplicity, the multitude of vain and useless ceremonies still remained in the church; nor did the pontiffs judge it proper to diminish that pomp and shew, that gave the ministers of religion a great, though ill-acquired, influence on the minds of the people. Besides; many popular customs, and inventions, which were multiplied by the clergy, and were either entirely absurd or grossly superstitious, called loudly for redress; and, indeed, the council of *Trent* seemed disposed to correct these abuses and prevent their farther growth. But this good design was never carried into execution; it was abandoned either through the corrupt prudence of the

[m] The history and transactions of this *Congregation* are related and illustrated by several writers of different complexions, by Jesuits, Dominicans, and Jansenists. HYACINTH SERRI, a Dominican, published, under the feigned name of AUGUSTIN LE BLANC, in the year 1700, at *Louvain*, a work entitled, *Historia Congregationum de auxiliis Gratiæ divinæ*; which was answered by another history of these debates composed by LIV. DE MEYER, a Jesuit, who assumed the name of THEOD. ELEUTHERIUS, in order to lie concealed from public view, and whose book is entitled, *Historia Controversiarum de Gratiæ divinæ auxiliis*. The Dominicans also published the *Acta congregationum et disputationum, quæ coram Clemente VIII, et Paulo V, de auxiliis divinæ Gratiæ sunt celebratæ*, a work composed by THOMAS DE LEMOS, a subtle monk of their order, who, in this very congregation, had defended with great applause the glory of St. THOMAS against the Jesuits.—Amidst these jarring accounts, a man must be endowed with a supernatural sagacity to come at the truth. For acts are opposed to acts, testimony to testimony, and narration to narration. It is therefore as yet a matter of doubt, which the court of *Rome* favoured most, on this occasion, the Jesuits or the Dominicans, and which of these two parties defended their cause with the most dexterity and success.—There is also a history of these debates written in French, which was published in 8° at *Louvain*, in the year 1702, under the following title: *Histoire des Congregations de auxiliis par un Docteur de la Faculté de Theologie de Paris*. This historian, though he be neither destitute of learning nor elegance, being nevertheless a flaming Jansenist, discovers throughout his enmity against the Jesuits, and relates all things in a manner that favours the cause of the Dominicans.

pope and clergy, who looked upon every check given to superstition as an attempt to diminish their authority, or through their criminal negligence about every thing that tended to promote the true interests of religion. Hence it happens, that in those countries, where there are few protestants, and consequently where the church of *Rome* is in no danger of losing its credit and influence from the proximity and attempts of these pretended heretics, superstition reigns with unlimited extravagance and absurdity. Such is the case in *Italy*, *Spain*, and *Portugal*, where the feeble glimmerings of Christianity, that yet remain, are overwhelmed and obscured by an enormous multitude of ridiculous ceremonies, and absurd, fantastic, and unaccountable rites; so that a person who arrives in any of these countries, after having passed through other nations even of the *Romish* communion, is immediately struck with the change, and thinks himself transported into the thickest darkness, into the most gloomy retreats of superstition [n]. Nor, indeed, are even those countries, whom the neighbourhood of the protestants and a more free and liberal turn of mind have rendered somewhat less absurd, entirely exempt from the dominion of superstition and the solemn fooleries that always attend it; for the religion of *Rome*, in its best form and in those places where its external worship is the least shocking, is certainly loaded with rites and observances that are highly offensive to sound reason. If from this general view of things we descend to a more circumstantial consideration of the innumerable abuses that are established in the discipline of that church; if we attend to the pious, or rather impious, frauds which are imposed, with impunity, upon the deluded multitude, in many places; if we pass in review the corruption of the clergy, the ignorance of the people, the devout farces that are acted in the ceremonies of public worship, and the insipid jargon and trifling rhetoric that prevail in the discourses of the *Roman-catholic* preachers; if we weigh all these things maturely, we shall find, that they have little regard to impartiality and truth, who pretend that since the council of *Trent* the religion and worship of the *Roman church* have been every where corrected and amended.

[n] It is well known that the French, who travel into *Italy*, employ the whole force of their wit and raillery in rendering ridiculous the monstrous superstition of the Italians. The Italians, in their turn, look upon the French that visit their country as totally destitute of all principles of religion. This is evidently the case, as we learn from the testimony of many writers, and particularly from that of Father LABAT, in his *Voyages en Italie et en Espagne*. This agreeable Dominican lets no opportunity escape of censuring and exposing the superstition of the Spaniards and Italians; nor does he pretend to deny that his countrymen, and even he himself, passed for impious libertines in the opinion of these bigots.

C H A P. II.

The History of the Greek and Eastern Churches.

CENT. XVI.

The eastern church may be divided into three branches.

The Greek church, properly speaking,

is for the most part subject to the patriarch of Constantinople,

and is divided into four provinces or districts here described.

I. THE society of Christians, that goes under the general denomination of the eastern church, is dispersed throughout *Europe*, *Asia*, and *Africa*, and may be divided into three distinct communities. The first is that of the Greek Christians, who agree in all points of doctrine and worship, with the patriarch, residing at *Constantinople*, and reject the pretended supremacy of the Roman pontif. The second comprehends those Christians, who differ equally from the Roman pontif and the Grecian patriarch in their religious opinions and institutions, and who live under the government of their own bishops and rulers. The third is composed of those who are subject to the see of *Rome*.

II. That society of Christians, that lives in religious communion with the patriarch of *Constantinople* is, properly speaking, the Greek, though it assumes likewise the title of the Eastern church. This society is subdivided into two branches, of which the one acknowledges the supreme authority and jurisdiction of the bishop of *Constantinople*; while the other, though joined in communion of doctrine and worship with that prelate, yet obstinately refuses to receive his legates, or to obey his edicts, and is governed by its own laws and institutions, under the jurisdiction of spiritual rulers, who are independent on all foreign authority.

III. That part of the Greek church, which acknowledges the jurisdiction of the bishop of *Constantinople*, is divided, as in the early ages of Christianity, into four large districts or provinces, *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Jerusalem*, over every one of which a bishop presides with the title of Patriarch, whom the inferior bishops and monastic orders unanimously respect as their common Father. But the supreme chief of all these patriarchs, bishops, and abbots, and, generally speaking, of the whole church, is the patriarch of *Constantinople*. This prelate has the privilege of nominating the other patriarchs, though that dignity still continues elective, and of approving the election that is made; nor is there any thing of moment undertaken or transacted in the church without his express permission, or his especial order. It is true, indeed, that, in the present decayed state of the Greek churches, whose revenues are so small, and whose former opulence is reduced almost to nothing, their spiritual rulers enjoy little more than the splendid title of *Patriarchs*, without being in a condition to extend their fame or promote their cause by any undertaking of signal importance.

IV. The spiritual jurisdiction and dominion of the patriarch of *Constantinople* are very extensive, comprehending a considerable part of *Greece*, the *Grecian Isles*, *Wallachia*, *Moldavia*, and several of the European and Asiatic provinces that are subject to the *Turk*. The patriarch of *Alexandria* resides generally at *Cairo*, and exercises his spiritual authority in *Egypt*, *Nubia*, *Libya*,

Libya, and part of *Arabia* [o]. DAMASCUS is the principal residence of the patriarch of *Antioch*, whose jurisdiction extends to *Mesopotamia*, *Syria*, *Cilicia*, and other provinces [p], while the patriarch of *Jerusalem* comprehends, within the bounds of his pontificate, *Palestine*, *Syria* [q], *Arabia*, the country beyond *Jordan*, *Cana* in *Galilee*; and mount *Sion* [r]. The episcopal dominions of these three patriarchs are, indeed, extremely poor and inconsiderable; for the Monophysites have long since assumed the patriarchal seats of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, and have deprived the Greek churches of the greatest part of their members in all those places where they have gained an ascendant. And as *Jerusalem* is the resort of Christians of every sect, who have their respective bishops and rulers, the jurisdiction of the Grecian patriarch is consequently confined there within narrow limits.

V. The right of electing the patriarch of *Constantinople* is, at this day, vested in the twelve bishops who reside nearest that famous capital; but the right of confirming this election, and of enabling the new-chosen patriarch to exercise his spiritual functions, belongs only to the Turkish emperor. This institution, however, if it is not entirely overturned, is nevertheless on many occasions prostituted in a shameful manner by the corruption and avarice of the reigning ministers. Thus it happens, that many bishops, inflamed with the ambitious lust of power and pre eminence, purchase by money what they cannot obtain by merit, and seeing themselves excluded from the patriarchal dignity by the suffrages of their brethren, find an open

The patriarch of
Constantinople.

[o] For an account of the patriarchate of *Alexandria*, and the various prelates who have filled that see, it will be proper to consult SOLLERII *Commentar. de Patriarchis Alexandrinis*, which is prefixed to the fifth volume of the *Acta Sanctorum, Mensis Junii*; as also the *Oriens Christianus* of LE QUIEN, tom. ii. p. 329. The nature of their office, the extent of their authority, and the manner of their creation, is accurately described by EUS. RENAUDOT, in his *Dissertatio de Patriarcha Alexandrino*, which is published in the first volume of his *Liturgie Orientales*, p. 365.—The Grecian patriarch has, at this day, no bishops under his jurisdiction; the *chorepiscopi* or rural bishops alone are subject to his authority. All the bishops acknowledge as their chief the patriarch of the *Monophysites*, who is, in effect, the patriarch of *Alexandria*.

[p] The jesuits have prefixed a particular and learned account of the patriarchs of *Antioch* to the fifth volume of the *Acta SS mensis Julii*, in which, however, there are some omissions and defects. Add to this the account that is given of the district or diocese of the patriarch of *Antioch* by MICHEL LE QUIEN, in his *Oriens Christianus*, tom. ii. p. 670. and by BLASIUS TERTIUS, in his *Siria Sacra ou Description Historico-Geografica delle due Chiese Patriarchali, Antiocha, et Jerusalem*, published in folio at Rome, in the year 1695. There are three bishops in Syria which claim the title and dignity of patriarch of *Antioch*. The first is the bishop of the *Melchites*, a name given to the Christians in Syria, who follow the doctrine, institutions, and worship of the Greek church; the second is the spiritual guide of the Syrian *Monophysites*; and the third is the chief of the *Maronites*, who hold communion with the church of Rome. This last bishop pretends to be the true and lawful patriarch of *Antioch*, and is acknowledged as such, or, at least, receives this denomination from the Roman pontif. And yet it is certain, that the pope creates at Rome a patriarch of *Antioch* of his own choice. So that the see of *Antioch* has, at this day, four patriarchs, one from the Greeks, two from the Syrians, and one created at Rome, who is patriarch *in partibus*, i. e. titular patriarch, according to the signification of that usual phrase.

[q] Syria is here erroneously placed in the patriarchate of *Jerusalem*, as it evidently belongs to that of *Antioch*, in which also Dr MOSHEIM places it in the preceding sentence.]

[r] BLAS. TERTII *Siria Sacra*, lib. ii. p. 165.—D. PAPEBROCHII *Comment. de Patriarch. Hierosolym.* tom. iii. *Actor. Sanct. Mens. Maii*.—LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christ.* tom. iii. p. 102.

and

CENT. XVI. and ready way to it by the mercenary services of men in power. Nay, what is yet more deplorable, has frequently happened; even that prelates, who have been chosen in the lawful way to this eminent office, have been deposed in order to make way for others, whose only pretensions were ambition and bribery. And, indeed, generally speaking, he is looked upon by the Turkish vizirs as the most qualified for the office of patriarch, who surpasses his competitors in the number and value of the presents he employs on that occasion. It is true some accounts worthy of credit represent the present state of the Greek church as advantageously changed in this respect, and it is reported, that, as the Turkish manners have gradually assumed a milder and more humane cast, the patriarchs live under their dominion with more security and repose than they did some ages ago.

The power of the patriarch among a people dispirited by oppression, and sunk, through their extreme ignorance, in the greatest superstition, must undoubtedly be very considerable and extensive; and such, indeed, it is. Its extent, however, is not entirely owing to the causes now mentioned, but to others that give no small weight and lustre to the patriarchal dignity. For this prelate does not only call councils, by his own authority, in order to decide, by their assistance, the controversies that arise, and to make use of their prudent advice and wise deliberations in directing the affairs of the church; his prerogatives go yet farther, and, by the special permission of the emperor, he administers justice and takes cognizance of civil causes among the members of his communion. His influence is maintained on the one hand, by the authority of the Turkish monarch, and, on the other, by his right of excommunicating the disobedient members of the Greek church. This right gives the patriarch a singular degree of influence and authority, as nothing has a more terrifying aspect to that people than a sentence of excommunication, which they reckon among the greatest and most tremendous evils. The revenue of this prelate is drawn particularly from the churches that are subject to his jurisdiction, and its produce varies according to the state and circumstances of the Greek Christians, whose condition is exposed to many vicissitudes [t].

The doctrine of
the Greek
church.

VI. The holy scriptures and the decrees of the first seven *general* councils are acknowledged by the Greeks as the rule of their faith. It is received, however, as a maxim established by long custom, that no private person has a right to explain, for himself or others, either the declarations of scripture, or the decisions of these councils; and that the patriarch, with his brethren, are alone authorised to consult these oracles, and to declare their meaning. And accordingly, the declarations of this prelate are looked upon as sacred and infallible directions, whose authority is supreme, and which can neither

[s] LEQUIEN, *ibid.* tom. i. p. 145.—ELSNER, *Beschreibung der Griechischen Christen in der Turkey*, p. 54.

[t] CEPER, a Jesuit, has given a *History of the Patriarchs of Constantinople*. in the *Acta Sanctorum Mensis Augusti*, tom. i. p. 1—257.—There is also a very ample account both of the see of Constantinople and its patriarchs, in the first volume of the *Oriens Christianus* of MICH. LEQUIEN, who treats, moreover, of the Latin patriarchs of that city, in the third volume of the same work, p. 786.

be transgressed nor disregarded without the utmost impiety. The substance CENT. XVI. of the doctrine of the Greek church is contained in a treatise, entitled, *The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church*, which was drawn up by PETER MOGISLAUS, bishop of *Kiow*, in a provincial council assembled in that city. This confession was translated into Greek [*u*], and publicly approved and adopted, in the year 1643, by PARTHENIUS of *Constantinople*, and all the other Grecian patriarchs. It was afterwards published in Greek and Latin at the expence of PANAGIOTA, the Turkish emperor's interpreter, a man of great opulence and liberality, who ordered it to be distributed *gratis* among the Greek Christians, and it was also enriched with a recommendatory letter composed by NECTARIUS, patriarch of *Jerusalem* [*w*]. It appears evidently from this confession, that the Greeks differ widely from the votaries of the Roman pontif, whose doctrines they reject and treat with indignation in several places; but it appears, at the same time, that their religious tenets are equally remote from those of other Christian societies. So that whoever peruses this treatise with attention, will be fully convinced, how much certain writers are mistaken, who imagine that the obstacles which prevent the union of the Greeks with this or the other Christian community, are but small and inconsiderable [*x*].

VII. The votaries of *Rome* have found this to be true on many occasions. And the Lutherans made an experiment of the same kind, when they presented a fruitless invitation to the Greek churches to embrace their doctrine and discipline, and live with them in religious communion. The first steps in this laudable attempt were taken by MELANCTHON, who sent to the patriarch of *Constantinople* a copy of the confession of *Augsburg*, translated into Greek by PAUL DOLSCIUS. This present was accompanied with a letter, in which the learned and humane professor of *Wittemberg* represented the protestant doctrine with the utmost simplicity and faithfulness, hoping that the artless charms of truth might touch the heart of the Grecian prelate. But his hopes were disappointed, for the patriarch did not even deign to send him

The design of uniting the Greeks with the protestants miscarries.

[*u*] It was originally composed in the Russian language.

[*w*] This *confession* was published in 8° at *Leipsick*, with a Latin translation, by LAUR. NORMANNUS, in the year 1695. In the Preface we are informed that it had been composed by NECTARIUS: but this assertion is refuted by NECTARIUS himself, in a letter which follows immediately the Preface. It is also affirmed both in the Preface and Title-page, that this is the first public edition that has been given of the Greek confession. But this assertion is also false; since it is well known that it was published in *Holland*, in the year 1662, at the expence of PANAGIOTA. The German translation of this confession was published at *Francfort* and *Leipsick* in 4° in 1727. The learned Jo. CHRIST. KOCHERUS has given, with his usual accuracy and erudition, an ample account both of this and the other confessions received among the Greeks, in his *Bibliotheca Theologiae Symbol.* p. 45 & 53. and the laborious Dr. HOFFMAN, principal Professor of Divinity at *Wittemberg*, published at *Breslaw* in 1751, a new edition of the *Orthodox Confession*, with an historical account of it. Those, who are desirous of a circumstantial account of the famous PANAGIOTA, to whom this confession is indebted for a considerable part of its credit, and who has rendered to the Greek church in general the most eminent services, will find it in CANTEMIR's *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, tom. iii. p. 149.

[*x*] The learned FABRICIUS has given, in the tenth volume of his *Bibliotheca Græca*, p. 441. an exact and ample list of the writers, whom it is proper to consult in order to the forming a just notion of the state, circumstances, and doctrines of the Greek church.

CENT. XVI. an answer [y]. After this the divines of *Tubingen* renewed, with his successor JEREMIAH [z], the correspondence which had been begun by MALANCTHON. They wrote frequently, during the course of several years [a], to the new patriarch, sent him another copy of the *confession* of *Augsburg*, together with a *Compend of Theology*, composed by HEERBRAND, and translated into Greek by MARTIN CRUSIUS; nor did they leave unemployed any means, which a pious and well-conducted zeal could suggest as proper to gain over this prelate to their communion. The fruits, however, of this correspondence were very inconsiderable, and wholly consisted in a few letters from the Greek patriarch, written, indeed, with an amiable spirit of benevolence and cordiality; but at the same time in terms which shewed the impossibility of the union so much desired by the protestants. The whole strain of these letters discovered in the Greeks an inviolable attachment to the opinions and institutions of their ancestors, and was sufficient to demonstrate the vanity of attempting to dissolve it in the present situation and circumstances of that people [b].

The miserable
state of the
Greeks.

VIII. Nothing, indeed, more deplorable can be conceived than the state of the greatest part of the Greeks, since their subjection to the oppressive yoke of the Turkish emperors. Since that fatal period almost all learning and science, human and divine, have been extinguished among them. They have neither schools, colleges, nor any of those literary establishments that ennoble human nature by sowing in the mind the immortal seeds of knowledge and virtue. Those few that surpass the vulgar herd in intellectual acquirements have derived this advantage from the schools of learning in *Sicily* or *Italy*, where the studious Greeks usually repair in quest of knowledge; or from a perusal of the writings of the ancient doctors, and more especially of the theology of St. THOMAS, which they have translated into their native language [c].

Such, at least, is the notion of the learning of the modern Greeks, that is entertained by all the European Christians, as well Roman-catholics as protestants, and it is built upon the clearest evidence and supported by testimonies of every kind. Many of the Greeks deny with obstinacy this inglorious charge, and not only defend their country-men against the imputation of such gross ignorance, but even go so far as to maintain that all the

[y] LEO ALLATIUS, *De perpetua Consensione Ecclesiae Orient. et Occident.* lib. iii. cap. viii. § ii. p. 1005.

[(z)] The name of the former patriarch was JOSEPH. In the year 1559, he had sent his Deacon DEMETRIUS to *Wittenberg*, to inform himself upon the spot of the genius and doctrines of the protestant religion.]

[a] This correspondence commenced in the year 1576, and ended in 1581.

[b] All the *Acts* and *Papers*, relating to this correspondence, were published in one volume at *Wittenberg*, in the year 1584, see CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFII *Liber de Actis et scriptis publicis Ecclesiae Wittenbergicae*, p. 50.—See also JO. ALB. FABRICII *Biblioth. Græcæ* vol. x. p. 517.—EMMAN. à SCHELSTRATE *Acta Ecclesiae Orientalis contra Lutheri hæresin*, published at *Rome* in the year 1739.—LAMI *Deliciae Eruditorum*, tom. viii. p. 176.

[(c)] The translator has inserted the note [k] of the original into the following paragraph of the English text, which begins thus: *Such, at least, &c.*]

liberal arts and sciences are in as flourishing a state in modern Greece, as they were in any period of the history of that nation. Among the writers that exalt the learning of the modern Greeks in such an extraordinary manner, the first place is due to an eminent historian [d], who has taken much pains to demonstrate the error of those who are of a different opinion. For this purpose he has not only composed a list of the learned men, that adorned that country in the last century, but also makes mention of an academy founded at *Constantinople* by a certain Greek, whose name was MANOLAX, in which all the branches of philosophy, as well as the liberal arts and sciences, are taught with the utmost success and applause, after the manner of the ancient sages of Greece. But all this, though matter of fact, does by no means amount to a satisfactory proof of the point in question. It only proves, what was never doubted of by any thinking person, that the populous nation of the Greeks, in which there is such a considerable number of ancient, noble, and opulent families, is not entirely destitute of men of learning and genius. But it does not at all demonstrate, that this nation, considered in general, is at present enriched with science either sacred or profane, or makes any shining figure in the republic of letters. In a nation, which, generally speaking, is sunk in the most barbarous ignorance, some men of genius and learning may arise, and shine like meteors in a gloomy firmament. With respect to the academy founded at *Constantinople*, it may be observed, that a literary establishment, so necessary and yet so recent, confirms the judgment that has been almost universally formed concerning the erudition of the Greeks.

This ignorance, that reigns among the Greeks, has the most pernicious influence upon their morals. Licentiousness and impiety not only abound among the people, but also dishonour their leaders; and the calamities, that arise from this corruption of manners, are deplorably augmented by their endless contentions and divisions. Their religion is a motley collection of ceremonies, the greatest part of which are either ridiculously trifling, or shockingly absurd. Yet they are much more zealous in retaining and observing these senseless rites, than in maintaining the doctrine or obeying the precepts of the religion they profess. Their misery would be extreme, were it not for the support they derive from the Greeks, who perform the functions of physicians and interpreters at the emperor's court; and who, by their opulence and credit, frequently interpose to reconcile the differences or to ward off the dangers that so often portend the destruction of their church.

IX. The *Russians*, *Georgians*, and *Mingrelians*, adopt the doctrines and ceremonies of the Greek church; though they are entirely free from the jurisdiction and authority of the patriarch of *Constantinople*. It is true, indeed, that this prelate had formerly enjoyed the privilege of a spiritual supremacy over the *Russians*, to whom he sent a bishop whenever a vacancy happened. But, towards the conclusion of this century, this privilege ceased by the following incident. JEREMIAH, patriarch of *Constantinople*, undertook a journey into *Moscovy* to levy pecuniary succours, against his

The Greek church independent on foreign jurisdiction.

[d] See DEM. CANTIMIR *Histoire de l'Empire Ottomann*, tom. ii. p. 38.

CENT. XVI.

rival METROPHANES, and to drive him, by the force of money, from the patriarchal throne. On this occasion, the Moscovite monks, in compliance, no doubt, with the secret orders of the Grand Duke THEODORE, the son of JOHN BASILIDES, employed all the influence both of threatnings and supplications to engage JEREMIAH to place at the head of the Moscovite nation, an independent patriarch. The patriarch of *Constantinople*, unable to resist such powerful solicitations, was forced to yield, and accordingly, in a council assembled at *Moscow* in the year 1589, nominated and proclaimed JOB, archbishop of *Rostow*, the first patriarch of the Moscovites. This extraordinary step was, however, taken on condition, that every new patriarch of the Russians should demand the consent and suffrage of the patriarch of *Constantinople*, and pay, at certain periods, fixed for that purpose, five hundred gold ducats. The transactions of this Moscovite council were afterwards ratified in one assembled by JEREMIAH at *Constantinople* in the year 1593, to which ratification the Turkish emperor gave his solemn consent [e]. But the privileges and immunities of the patriarch of *Moscow* were still farther extended about the middle of the following age, when the four eastern patriarchs, under the pontificate of DIONYSIUS II, patriarch of *Constantinople*, exempted him, at the renewed solicitation of the Grand Duke of *Moscow*, from the double obligation of paying tribute, and of depending, for the confirmation of his election and installation, on a foreign jurisdiction [f].

The Georgians
and Mingrelians

X. The *Georgians* and *Mingrelians*; or, as they were anciently called, the *Iberians* and *Colchians*, have declined so remarkably since the Mahometan dominion has been established in these countries, that they can scarcely be ranked in the number of Christians. Such, in a more especial manner, is the depraved state of the latter, who wander about in the woods and mountains, and lead a savage and undisciplined life; for among the *Georgians*, or *Iberians*, there are yet some remains of religion, morals, and humanity. These nations have a pontif at their head whom they call, the *Catholic*; they have also their bishops and priests; but these spiritual rulers are a dishonour to Christianity, by their ignorance, avarice, and profligacy; they surpass almost the populace in the corruption of their manners, and, grossly ignorant themselves of the truths and principles of religion, they never entertain the least thought of instructing the people. If therefore it be affirmed, that the *Georgians* and *Mingrelians*, at this day, are neither attached to the opinions of the *Monophysites*, nor to those of the *Nestorians*, but embrace the doctrine of the Greek church; this must be affirmed rather in consequence of probable conjecture, than of certain knowledge; since it is impossible almost to know, with any degree of precision, what are the sentiments of a people, who seem to lie in the thickest darkness. Any remains of religion, that

[e] See ANTON. POSSEVINI *Moscoria*.—MICH. LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 1292.—See also a relation of this transaction, which is published in the *Catalogus Codic. MSS. Biblioth. Taurinens.* p. 433—469.

[f] LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christian.* tom. i. p. 155.—NIC. BERGIUS, *De Ecclesia Moscovitica*, par. I. sect. I. c. xviii. p. 164.

are observable among them, are entirely comprehended in certain sacred festivals and external ceremonies, of which the former are celebrated, and the latter are performed, without the least appearance of decency; so that the priests administer the sacraments of baptism and of the Lord's supper with as little respect and devotion, as if they were partaking of an ordinary repast [g].

XI. The eastern Christians, who renounce the communion of the Greek church, and differ from it both in doctrine and worship, may be comprehended under two distinct classes. To the former belong the *Monophysites* or *Jacobites*, so called from JACOB ALBARDAI [b], who declare it as their opinion, that in the Saviour of the world there is only *one nature*; while the latter comprehends the followers of NESTORIUS, frequently called *Chaldeans*, from the country where they principally reside, and who suppose that there are two distinct persons or natures in the son of God. The *Monophysites* are subdivided into two sects or parties, the one African, the other Asiatic. At the head of the *Asiatics* is the patriarch of *Antioch*, who resides, for the most part, in the monastery of St. ANANIAS, which is situated near the city of *Merdin*, and sometimes at *Merdin*, his episcopal seat, as also at *Amida*, *Aleppo*, and other *Syrian* cities [i]. The government of this prelate is too extensive, and the churches, over which he presides, too numerous to admit of his performing, himself, all the duties of his high office; and therefore a part of the administration of the pontificate is given to a kind of colleague, who is called the *maphrian* or *primate* of the East, and whose doctrine and discipline are said to be adopted by the eastern churches beyond the *Tigris*. This primate used formerly to reside at *Tauris*, a city on the frontiers of *Armenia*; but his present habitation is the monastery of St. MATTHEW, which is in the neighbourhood of *Motusul*, a city of *Mesopotamia*. It is farther observable, that all the patriarchs of the *Jacobites* assume the denomination of IGNATIUS [k].

Of the eastern churches, that separate from the communion of the Greeks and Latins.

[g] CLEMENT GALLANUS, *Conciliatio Ecclesie Armenicæ cum Romana*, tom. i. p. 156.—GHARDIN, *Voyage en Perse*, &c. tom. i. p. 67. where the reader will find JES. MAR. ZAMPI's *Relation de la Colchide et Mingrelie*.—LAMBERTI *Relation de la Colchide ou Mingrelie*, in the *Recueil des Voyages au Nord*, tom. vii. p. 160.—LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 1333. 1339.—See also RICH. SIMON, *Histoire Critique des dogmes et ceremonies des chrétiens orientaux*, ch. v. & vi. p. 71. in which the learned author endeavours to remove, at least, a part of the reproach under which the *Georgians* and *Mingrelians* labour on account of their supposed ignorance and corruption. The *catholics* or *pontifs* of *Georgia* and *Mingrelia* are, at this day, independent on any foreign jurisdiction; they are, however, obliged to pay a certain tribute to the patriarch of *Constantinople*.

[b] This JACOB ALBARDAI restored, in the sixth century, the sect of the *Monophysites*, which was almost expiring to its former vigour, and modelled it anew; hence they were called *Jacobites*. This denomination is commonly used in an extensive sense, as comprehending all the *Monophysites*, excepting those of *Armenia*; it however more strictly and properly belongs only to those *Asiatic Monophysites*, of which JACOB ALBARDAI was the restorer and the chief. See SIMON, *Histoire de Chrétiens Orientaux*, ch. ix. p. 118. a work, nevertheless, that often wants correction.]

[i] ASSEMANI *Dissert. de Monophys.* tom. ii.—*Biblioth. Orient. Clem. Vatican.* § viii.—FAUST. NAIKON, *Euophia fidei Catholicæ ex Syrorum Monument.* par. I. p. 40.—LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christ.* tom. ii. p. 1343.

[k] ASSEMANI *Dissertat. de Monophysitis*, § viii.

XII. The

CENT. XVI.

The Copts and
Abyssinians.

XII. The African *Monophysites* are under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of *Alexandria*, who generally resides at *Grand Cairo*, and they are subdivided into *Copts* and *Abyssinians*. The denomination of *Copts* comprehends all those Christians, who dwell in *Egypt*, *Nubia*, and the countries adjacent, and whose condition is truly deplorable. Oppressed by the insatiable avarice and tyranny of the Turks, they draw out their wretched days in misery and want, and are unable to support either their patriarch or their bishops. These are not, however, left entirely destitute; since they are, in a manner, maintained by the liberality of those *Copts*, who, on account of their capacity in household affairs, and their dexterity in the exercise of several manual arts, highly useful, though entirely unknown to the Turks, have gained admittance into the principal Mahometan families [l]. As to the *Abyssinians*, they surpass considerably the *Copts* both in their numbers, their power, and their opulence; nor will this appear surprizing, when it is considered, that they live under the dominion of a Christian emperor; they, nevertheless, consider the Alexandrian pontif as their spiritual parent and chief, and consequently, instead of choosing their own bishop, receive from that prelate a *primate*, whom they call *abbuna*, and whom they acknowledge as their ghostly ruler [m].

The religious
doctrines and
rites of the Mo-
nophysites.

XIII. These Monophysites differ from other Christian societies, whether of the Greek or Latin communion, in several points both of doctrine and worship; though the principal reason of their separation lies in the opinion they entertain concerning the *nature and person* of JESUS CHRIST. Following the doctrine of DIOSCORUS, BARSUMA, XENAIAS, FULLO, and others, whom they consider as the heads or chief ornaments of their sect, they maintain that in CHRIST the *divine and human nature* were reduced into *one*, and consequently reject both the decrees of the council of *Chalcedon* and the famous letter of LEO the Great. That, however, they may not seem to have the least inclination towards the doctrine of EUTYCHES, which they profess to reject with the most ardent zeal, they propose their own system with the utmost caution and circumspection, and hold the following obscure principles: That the *two natures* are united in CHRIST without either *confusion or mixture*; so that though the nature of our Saviour be really *one*, yet it is at the same time, *two fold and compound* [n]. By this declaration it

[l] RENAUDOT published at Paris in 4^{to} in the year 1713, a very learned work, relative to the History of the Eastern Patriarchs, under the title of, *Historia Alexandrinorum Patriarcharum, Jacobitarum, &c.* He also published the Office used in the ordination of the Jacobite Patriarch, with remarks, in the first volume of his *Liturgie Orient.* p. 467.—The internal state of the Alexandrian or Coptic church, both with respect to doctrine and worship, is described by WANSLEY, in his *Histoire de l'Eglise d'Alexandrie que nous appellons celle de Jacobites-Coptes*, published at Paris in 1667. Add to this another work of the same author, entitled, *Relation d'un Voyage en Egypte*, p. 293. in which there is a particular account of the Coptic monasteries and religious orders. See also *Nouveaux Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus dans le Levant*, tom. ii. p. 9.—MALLET, *Description de l'Egypte*, tom. ii. p. 64.

[m] JOB LUDOLF *Comment. in Histor. Aethiop.* p. 451. 461. 466.—LOBO *Voyage d'Abissinie*, tom. ii. p. 36.—*Nouveaux Memoires des Missions dans le Levant*, tom. iv. p. 277.—MICH. LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christian.* tom. ii. p. 641.

[n] ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 25, 26, 29, 34, 117, 133, 135. appears,

appears, that those learned men, who look upon the difference between the *Monophysites* and the Greek and Latin churches, rather as a dispute about *words* than *things*, are not so far mistaken as some have imagined [o]. Be that as it may, both the Asiatic and African *Monophysites* of the present times are, generally speaking, so deeply sunk in ignorance, that their attachment to the doctrine, by which they are distinguished from other Christian societies, is rather founded on their own obstinacy and on the authority of their ancestors, than on any other circumstance; nor do they even pretend to appeal, in its behalf, to reason and argument [p].

XIV. The Armenians, though they agree with the other *Monophysites* in the main doctrine of that sect relating to the *unity* of the divine and human nature in CHRIST, differ from them, nevertheless, in many points of faith, discipline, and worship; and hence it comes to pass, that they hold no communion with that branch of the *Monophysites*, who are *Jacobites* in the more limited sense of that term. The Armenian church is governed by three patriarchs [r]. The chief of these, whose diocese comprehends the *Greater Armenia*, beholds forty-two archbishops subjected to his jurisdiction, and resides in a monastery at a place called *Echmiazin*. The revenues of this spiritual ruler are such as would enable him to live in the most splendid and magnificent manner [s]; but there is no mark of pomp or opulence in

277. 297 &c.—See, in the same work, ABULPHARAGE'S *Subtile Vindication of the Doctrine of his Sect*, vol. ii. p. 288. There is a complete and circumstantial account of the religion of the Abyssinians, in the *Theologia Aethiopica* of GREGORY the Abyssinian, published by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux evangelii toti orbi exoriens*, p. 716. where there is also a list of all the writers, who have given accounts of the Abyssinians.

[o] See LA CROZE, *Hist. du Christianisme des Indes*, p. 23.—ASSEMANI *loc. citat.* tom. ii. p. 291. 297.—RICH. SIMON *Histoire des Chrétiens Orientaux*, p. 119.—JO. JOACH. SCHRÖDERI *Thesaurus Linguae Armenicae*, p. 276. [The truth of the matter is, that the terms used by the *Monophysites* are something more than equivocal; they are contradictory. It may also be farther observed, that those, who pretend to hold a middle path between the doctrines of *Nestorius* and *Eutyches*, were greatly embarrassed, as it was almost impossible to oppose the one, without adopting, or at least appearing to adopt the other.]

[p] The liturgies of the Copts, the Syrian *Jacobites*, and the Abyssinians, have been published, with learned observations, by RENAUDOT, in the first and second volumes of his *Liturgiae Orientales*.

[q] The first writer, who gave a circumstantial account of the religion, and history of the Armenians, was CLEMENT GALANI, an Italian of the order of the *Theatins*, whose *Conciliatio Ecclesiae Armenicae cum Romana*, was published at Rome in three volumes in folio, in the year 1650. The other authors, who have treated of this branch of Ecclesiastical History, are enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens*, ch. xxxviii. p. 640. to which must be added, LEQUIEN *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 1362.—The *History of Christianity in Armenia*, which the learned LA CROZE has subjoined to his account of the progress of the Christian religion in *Abyssinia*, and which was published at the Hague in 1739, is by no means answerable to the importance and copiousness of the subject; which must be attributed to the age and infirmities of that author. For an account of the particular institutions and rites of the Armenians, see GEMELLI CARRETI *Voyage du tour du monde*, tom. ii. p. 146.

[(r)] Sir PAUL RICAUT mentions four; but his authority, were it more respectable than it really is, cannot be compared with that of the excellent sources from whence Dr. MOSHEIM draws his materials.]

[s] R. SIMON has subjoined to his *Histoire des Chrétiens Orient.* p. 217. an account of all the Armenian churches, that are subject to the jurisdiction of this grand patriarch. But this account, though taken from USCANUS, an Armenian bishop, is, nevertheless, defective in many respects.

his

CENT. XVI. his external appearance, nor in his domestic œconomy. His table is frugal, his habit plain; nor is he distinguished from the monks, with whom he lives, by any other circumstance than his superior power and authority. He is, for the most part, elected to his patriarchal dignity by the suffrages of the bishops assembled at *Echmiazin*, and his election is confirmed by the solemn approbation of the Persian monarch. The second patriarch of the Armenians, who is called the Catholic, resides at *Cis*, a city of *Cilicia*, rules over the churches established in *Cappadocia*, *Cilicia*, *Cyprus*, and *Syria*, and hath twelve archbishops under his jurisdiction. He also, at present, acknowledges his subordination to the patriarch of *Echmiazin*. The third and last in rank of the patriarchs abovementioned, who has no more than eight or nine bishops under his dominion, resides in the island of *Aghtamar*, which is in the midst of the Great Lake of *Varaspuracan*, and is looked upon by the other Armenians as the enemy of their church.

Besides these prelates, who are patriarchs in the true sense of that term, the Armenians have other spiritual leaders, who are honoured with the title of Patriarchs; but this, indeed, is no more than an empty title, unattended with the authority and prerogatives of the patriarchal dignity. Thus the archbishop of the Armenians, who lives at *Constantinople*, and whose authority is respected by the churches established in those provinces, that form the connexion between *Europe* and *Asia*, enjoys the title of Patriarch. The same denomination is given to the Armenian bishop who resides at *Jerusalem*; and to the prelate of the same nation, who has his episcopal seat at *Gaminec* in *Poland*, and governs the Armenian churches that are established in *Russia*, *Poland*, and the adjacent countries. These bishops assume the title of Patriarchs, on account of some peculiar privileges conferred on them by the Great Patriarch of *Echmiazin*. For by an authority derived from this supreme head of the Armenian church, they are allowed to consecrate bishops, and to make, every third year, and distribute among their congregations, the holy *chrism* or ointment, which, according to a constant custom among the eastern Christians, is the privilege of the patriarchs alone [t].

The Nestorians,
or Chaldeans.

XV. The *Nestorians*, who are also known by the denomination of *Chaldeans*, have fixed their habitations chiefly in *Mesopotamia* and the adjacent countries. They have several doctrines, as well as some religious ceremonies and institutions, that are peculiar to themselves. But the main points, that distinguish them from all other Christian societies, are, their persuasion that *NESTORIUS* was unjustly condemned by the council of *Ephesus*, and their firm attachment to the doctrine of that prelate, who maintained that there

For an account of the residence and manner of life of the patriarch of *ECHMIAZIN*, see PAUL LUCAS *Voyage au Levant*, tom. ii. p. 247. & GEMELLI CARRERI *Voyage du tour du monde*, tom. ii. p. 4 — 10.

[t] See the *Nouveaux Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. iii. p. 1—218. where there is an ample and circumstantial account both of the civil and religious state of the Armenians. This account has been highly applauded by M. DE LA CROZE, for the fidelity, accuracy, and industry, with which it is drawn up, and no man was more conversant in subjects of this nature than that learned author.—See LA CROZE, *Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie*, p. 345.

were

were not only two *natures*, but also two distinct *persons* in the son of God. CENT. XVI.
 In the earlier ages of the church, this error was looked upon as of the most momentous and pernicious kind; but in our times it is esteemed of less consequence, by persons of the greatest weight and authority in theological matters, even among the Roman-catholic doctors. They consider this whole controversy as a dispute about words, and the opinion of NESTORIUS, as a nominal, rather than a real, heresy; that is, as an error arising rather from the words he employed, than from his intention in the use of them. It is true, indeed, that the Chaldeans attribute to CHRIST two *natures*, and even two *persons*; but they correct what may seem rash in this expression, by adding, that these *natures* and *persons* are so closely and intimately united, that they have only one *aspect*. Now the word *barsopa*, by which they express this aspect, is precisely of the same signification with the Greek word (*προσωπον*) which signifies a *person* [u]; and from hence it is evident, that they attached to the word *aspect* the same idea that we attach to the word *person*, and that they understood by the word *person*, precisely what we understand by the term *nature*. However that be, we must observe here, to the lasting honour of the Nestorians, that, of all the Christian societies established in the East, they have been the most careful and successful in avoiding a multitude of superstitious opinions and practices that have infected the Greek and Latin churches [x].

XVI. In the earlier ages of Nestorianism the various branches of that numerous and powerful sect were under the spiritual jurisdiction of the same pontif, or *catholic*, who resided, first at *Bagdat*, and afterwards at *Mousoul*. But in this century the Nestorians were divided into two sects. They had chosen in the year 1552, as has been already observed, two bishops at the same time, SIMEON BARMAMA and JOHN SULAKA, otherwise named SIUD. The latter, to strengthen his interest, and to triumph over his competitor, went directly to *Rome* and acknowledged the jurisdiction, that he might be supported by the credit of the Roman pontif. In the year 1555, SIMEON DENHA, archbishop of *Gelu*, adopted the party of the fugitive patriarch, who had embraced the communion of the Latin church; and, being afterwards chosen patriarch himself, fixed his residence in the city of *Ormia*, in the mountainous parts of *Persia*, where his successors still continue, and are all distinguished by the name of SIMEON. So far down as the last century, these patriarchs persevered in their communion with the church of *Rome*, but seem, at present, to have withdrawn themselves from it [y]. The great

Their patriarchs

[u] It is in this manner that the sentiments of the Nestorians are explained in the inscriptions which adorn the tombs of their patriarchs in the city of *Mousul*.—See ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. par. II. p. 210.—R. SIMON *Histoire de la Creance des Chretiens Orientaux*, ch. vii. p. 94.—PETRUS STROZZA, *De dogmatibus Chaldeorum*, published in 8^{vo} at *Rome*, in the year 1617.

[x] See the learned dissertation of ASSEMANI *de Syris Nestorianis*, which occupies entirely the fourth volume of his *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* and which seems to have been much consulted, and partly copied by MICH. LEQUIEN, in the eleventh volume of his *Oriens Christianus*, p. 1078.

[y] See JOS. SIM. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 538. & tom. ii. p. 456.

CENT. XVI. Nestorian pontiffs, who form the opposite party, and look with an hostile eye on this little patriarch, have, since the year 1559, been distinguished by the general denomination of ELIAS, and reside constantly in the city of *Mousoul* [z]. Their spiritual dominion is very extensive, takes in a great part of *Asia*, and comprehends also within its circuit the Arabian Nestorians; as also the CHRISTIANS of *St. Thomas*, who dwell along the coast of *Malabar* [a].

The remains of
ancient sects.

XVII. Beside the Christian societies now mentioned, who still retained some faint shadow, at least, of that system of religion delivered by CHRIST and his Apostles, there were other sects dispersed through a great part of *Asia*, whose principles and doctrines were highly pernicious. These sects derived their origin from the Ebionites, Valentinians, Manicheans, Basilidians, and other separatists, who, in the early ages of Christianity, excited schisms and factions in the church. Equally abhorred by Turks and Christians, and thus suffering oppression from all quarters, they declined from day to day, and fell, at length, into such barbarous superstition and ignorance, as extinguished among them every spark of true religion. Thus were they reduced to the wretched and ignominious figure they at present make, having fallen from the privileges, and almost forfeited the very name of Christians. The sect, who pass in the East under the denomination of *Sabians*, who call themselves *Mendai Habi*, or the disciples of JOHN, and whom the Europeans entitle the *Christians of St. JOHN*, because they yet retain some knowledge of the gospel, is probably of Jewish origin, and seems to have been derived from the ancient *Hemerobaptists*, of whom the writers of ecclesiastical history make frequent mention [b]. This, at least, is certain, that that JOHN, whom they consider as the founder of their sect, bears no sort of similitude to JOHN the Baptist, but rather resembles the person of that name whom the ancient writers represent as the chief of the Jewish *Hemerobaptists* [c]. These ambiguous Christians, whatever their origin be, dwell in *Persia* and *Arabia*, and principally at *Bassora*; and their religion consists in bodily washings, performed frequently and with great solemnity.

[z] A list of the Nestorian pontiffs is given by ASSEMANI, in his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* tom. iii. par. I. p. 611. which is corrected, however, in the same volume, par. II. p. cml.—See also LEQUIEN *Oriens Christianus*, tom. ii. p. 1078.

[a] The reader will find an ample account of the *Christians of St. Thomas* in LA CROZE, *Histoire du Christianisme des Indes*.—See also ASSEMANI *loc. citat.* tom. iii. par. II. cap. ix. p. ccccxiii.

[(b)] The sect of *Hemerobaptists* among the Jews were so called from their washing themselves every day, and their performing this custom with the greatest solemnity, as a religious rite necessary to salvation. The account of this sect given by EPIPHANIUS, in the Introduction to his book of Heresies, has been treated as a fiction, in consequence of the suspicions of inaccuracy and want of veracity under which that author too justly labours. Nay, the existence of the *Hemerobaptists* has been denied, but without reason; since they are mentioned by JUSTIN MARTYR, EUSEBIUS, and many other ancient writers, every way worthy of credit. That the *Christians of St. John* were descended from this sect, is rendered probable by many reasons, of which the principal and the most satisfactory may be seen in a very learned and ingenious work of Dr. MOSHEIM, entitled, *MOSHEIMI De Rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum Magnum Commentarii*, p. 44.]

[(c)] The *Mendæans* at present perform these ablutions only once in a year. Id. ib. p. 45.]

nity [c], and attended with certain ceremonies which the priests mingle with CENT. XVI. this superstitious service [d].

XVIII. The *Jasidians*, or *Jezdæans*, of whose religion and manners many The Jasidians, or Jezdæans. reports of a very doubtful nature are given by voyage writers, are an unsettled wandering tribe, who frequent the *Gordian* mountains, and the desarts of *Curdistan*, a province of *Persia*; the character of whose inhabitants has something in it peculiarly fierce and intractable. The *Jezdæans* are divided into *black* and *white* members. The former are the priests and rulers of the sect, who go arrayed in sable garments; while the latter, who compose the multitude, are cloathed in white. Their system of religion is certainly very singular, and is not hitherto sufficiently known; though it be evidently composed of some Christian doctrines, and a motley mixture of fictions drawn from a different source. They are distinguished from the other corrupt sects, that have dishonoured Christianity, by the peculiar impiety of their opinion concerning the evil genius. This malignant principle they call *Karubin* or *Cherubim*, i. e. one of the great ministers of the supreme Being. And if they don't directly address religious worship to this evil minister, they treat him at least with the utmost respect, and not only abstain, themselves, from offering him any marks of hatred or contempt, but moreover will not suffer any contumelious treatment to be given him by others. Nay, they are said to carry this reverence and circumspection to such an excessive height, that no efforts of persecution, no torments, not even death itself, can engage them to conceive or express an abhorrence of

[(c) See the last note.]

[d] See the work of a learned Carmelite named *IGNATIUS A JESU*, published at *Rome* in 8^{vo}. in the year 1652, under the following title: *Narratio originis rituum et errorum Christianorum S. Johannis: cui adjungitur discursus per modum Dialogi, in quo confutantur xxxiv errores ejusdem nationis.*—*ENGELB. KAEMPFER* *Amoenitates Exoticæ Fascic. II. Relat. XI. p. 35.*—*SALE's Preface to his English Translation of the Koran, p. 15.*—*ASSEMANI Biblioth. Oriental. tom. iii. par. II. p. 609.*—*THEVENOT Voyages, tom. iv. p. 584.*—*HERBELOT Biblioth. Orient. p. 725.*—The very learned *BAYER* had composed an historical account of these *Mendæans*, which contained a variety of curious and interesting facts, and of which he designed that I should be the editor, but a sudden death prevented his executing his intention. He was of opinion (as appears from the *Thesaurus Epistolicus Crozianus, tom. i. p. 21.*) that these *Mendæans*, or *Disciples of St. John*, were a branch of the ancient *Manicheans*, which opinion *LA CROZE*, himself, seems to have adopted, as may be seen in the work now cited, *tom. iii. p. 31. 52.* But there is really nothing, either in the doctrines or manners of this sect, that resembles the opinions and practice of the *Manicheans*. Hence several learned men conjecture, that they derive their origin from the ancient idolators who worshiped a plurality of gods, and more especially from those who payed religious adoration to the stars of heaven, and who were called, by the Arabians, *Sabians* or *Sabeans* (*Sabiin*). This opinion has been maintained with much erudition by the famous *FOURMONT*, in a *Dissertation* inserted in the eighteenth volume of the *Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres, p. 23.* But it is absolutely groundless, and has not even a shadow of probability, if we except the name which the *Mahometans* usually give to this sect. The *Mendæans*, themselves, acknowledge that they are of Jewish origin, and that they were translated out of *Palestine* into the country, they at present inhabit. They have sacred books of a very remote antiquity; among others, one which they attribute to *ADAM*, and another composed by *JOHN*, whom they revere as the founder of their sect. As these books have been some years ago added to the library of the king of *France*, it is to be hoped, that they may contribute to give us a more authentic account of this people than we have hitherto received.

CENT. XVI. this evil genius, and that they will make no scruple to put to death such persons, as express, in their presence, an aversion to him [e].

Durazians, or
Durfians.

XIX. The *Durazians*, or *Durfians*, a fierce and warlike people that inhabit the craggy rocks and inhospitable wilds of mount *Libanus*, give themselves out for descendants of the Franks, who, from the eleventh century, carried on the Holy war with the Mahometans in *Palestine*; though this pretended origin is a matter of the greatest uncertainty. What the doctrine and discipline of this nation are at present, is extremely difficult to know, as they are at the greatest pains imaginable to conceal their religious sentiments and principles. We find, however, both in their opinions and practice, the plainest proofs of their acquaintance with Christianity. Several learned men have imagined, that both they and the *Curdi* of *Persia* had formerly embraced the sentiments of the Manicheans, and perhaps still persevere in their pernicious errors [f].

The *Chamfi*, or *Selares*, who reside in a certain district of *Mesopotamia*, are supposed, by curious inquirers into these matters, to be a branch of the *Samsæans* mentioned by EPIPHANIUS [g].

There are many other Semi-christian sects, of these kinds, in the east [h], whose principles, tenets, and institutions, are far from being unworthy of the curiosity of the learned. And those who would be at the pains to turn their researches this way, and more especially to have the religious books of these sects conveyed into *Europe*, would undoubtedly render eminent service to the cause of sacred literature, and obtain applause from all who have a taste for the study of Christian antiquities. For the accounts which have hitherto been given of these nations and sects are full of uncertainty and contradiction.

[e] See HYDE, *Historia Relig. Veter. Persarum in Append.* p. 549.—OTTER, *Voyage en Turquie et en Perse*, tom. i. p. 121. tom. ii. p. 249. In the last century MICHAEL NAU, a learned Jesuit, undertook to instruct this profane sect, and to give them juster notions of religion (see D'ARVIEUX *Memoires ou Voyages*, tom. vi. p. 362. 377.) and after him another Jesuit, whose name was MONIER, embarked in the same dangerous enterprize (see *Memoires des Missions des Jesuites*, tom. iii. p. 291.) but how they were received, and what success attended their ministry, is hitherto unknown. RHENFERDIUS, as appears from the letters of the learned GISBERT CUPER, published by BAYER (see p. 30.) considered the *Jesdæans* as the descendants of the ancient *Sethians*. But this opinion is no less improbable than that which makes them a branch of the Manicheans; which is sufficiently refuted by their sentiments concerning the *Evil Genius*. BEAUSOBRE, in his *Histoire de Manicheisme*, tom. ii. p. 613. conjectures that the denomination of this sect is derived from the name of JESUS; but it seems rather to be borrowed from the word *Jaxid*, or *Jezdan*, which, in the Persian language, signifies the *Good God*, and is opposed to *Abrimne*, or *Arimanius*, the *Evil Principle* (see HERBELOT *Biblioth. Orientale*, p. 484.—CHAREFEDDIN ALY *Hist. de Timurbec*, tom. iii. p. 81.) so that the term *Jaxidans* points out that sect as the worshippers of the good, or true God. Notwithstanding the plausibility of this account of the matter, it is not impossible that the city *Jezd*, of which OTTER speaks in his *Voyage en Turquie et en Perse*, tom. i. p. 283. may have given rise to the title of *Jaxidians*, or *Jezdæans*.

[f] See LUCAS, *Voyage en Grèce et Asie Mineure*, tom. ii. p. 36.—HYDE, *Histo. Relig. Veter. Persar.* p. 491. 554.—SIR PAUL RICAUT's *History of the Ottoman Empire*, vol. i. p. 313.

[g] HYDE, *Histo. Relig. Veter. Persar.* p. 555.

[h] See the work of the Jesuit DIUSSE, entitled, *Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses des Missions Etrangères*, tom. i. p. 63. This author tells us, that in the mountains, which separate *Persia* from *India*, there lives a sect of Christians, who imprint the sign of the cross on their bodies with a red-hot iron.

XX. The missionaries of *Rome* have never ceased to display in these parts of the world their dexterity in making profelytes, and accordingly have founded, though with great difficulty and expence, among the greatest part of the sects now mentioned, congregations that adopt the doctrine, and acknowledge the jurisdiction, of the Roman pontif. It is abundantly known, that, among the Greeks, who live under the empire of the Turk, and also among those, who are subject to the dominion of the Venetians, the emperor of the Romans and other Christian princes, there are several who have adopted the faith and discipline of the Latin church, and are governed by their own clergy and bishops, who receive their confirmation and authority from *Rome*. In this latter city there is a college expressly founded with a view to multiply these apostatizing societies, and to encrease and strengthen the credit and authority of the Roman pontif among the Greeks. In these colleges a certain number of Grecian students, who have given early marks of genius and capacity, are instructed in the arts and sciences, and are more especially prepossessed with the deepest sentiments of veneration and zeal for the authority of the pope. Such an institution, accompanied with the efforts and labours of the missionaries, could not fail, one would think, to gain an immense number of profelytes to *Rome*, considering the unhappy state of the Grecian churches. But the case is quite otherwise; for the most respectable writers, even of the Roman-catholic persuasion, acknowledge fairly, that the profelytes they have drawn from the Greek churches make a wretched and despicable figure, in point of number, opulence, and dignity, when compared with those, to whom the religion, government, nay, the very name of *Rome*, are disgusting and odious. They observe farther that the sincerity of a great part of these profelytes is of the Grecian stamp; so that, when a favourable occasion is offered them of renouncing, with advantage, their pretended conversion, they seldom fail, not only to return to the bosom of their own church, but even to recompense the good offices they received from the Romans with the most injurious treatment. The same writers mention another circumstance, much less surprizing, indeed, than those now mentioned, but much more dishonourable to the church of *Rome*; and that circumstance is, that even those of the Greek students who are educated at *Rome* with such care, as might naturally attach them to its religion and government, are, nevertheless, so disgusted and shocked at the corruptions of its church, clergy, and people, that they forget, more notoriously than others, the obligations with which they have been loaded, and exert themselves with peculiar obstinacy and bitterness in opposing the credit and authority of the Latin church [i].

CENT. XVI.

Of the Greeks
who embraced
the Roman com-
munion.

[i] See, among other authors who have treated this point of history, URB. CERRI *Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 82. in which, speaking of the Greeks, he expresses himself in the following manner: *Ils deviennent les plus violens ennemis des Catholiques, lorsqu'ils ont appris nos sciences, et qu'ils ont connoissance de nos IMPERFECTIONS: i. e.* in plain English, *They (the Greeks) become the bitterest enemies of us Roman-catholics, when they have been instructed in our sciences, and have acquired the knowledge of our IMPERFECTIONS.* Other testimonies of a like nature shall be given hereafter.—MICH. LEQUIEN has given us an enumeration, although a defective one, of the Greek bishops that follow the rites of the Roman church, in his *Oriens Cbrist.* tom. iii. p. 860.

CENT. XVI.

A junction between the Russians and Roman churches attempted in vain.

XXI. In their efforts to extend the papal empire over the Greek churches the designing pontifs did not forget the church of *Russia*, the chief bulwark and ornament of the Grecian faith. On the contrary, frequent deliberations were held at *Rome* about the proper methods of uniting, or rather subjecting, this church to the papal hierarchy. In this century JOHN BASILIDES, Grand Duke of the Russians, seemed to discover a propensity towards this union, by sending, in the year 1580, a solemn embassy to GREGORY XIII, to exhort that pontif to resume the negociations relative to this important matter, that so they might be brought to a happy and speedy conclusion. Accordingly the year following, ANTHONY POSSEVIN, a learned and artful Jesuit, was charged with this commission by the Roman pontif, and sent into *Moscow* to bring it into execution. But this dexterous Missionary, though he spared no pains to obtain the purposes of his ambitious court, found by experience that all his efforts were unequal to the task he had undertaken; nor did the Russian ambassadors, who arrived at *Rome* soon after, bring any thing to the ardent wishes of the pontif, but empty promises, conceived in dubious and general terms, on which little dependance could be made [k]. And, indeed, the event abundantly shewed, that BASILIDES had no other view, in all these negociations, than to flatter the pope, and obtain his assistance in order to bring to an advantageous conclusion the unsuccessful war, which he had carried on against *Poland*.

The ministry of POSSEVIN and his associates was, however, attended with more fruit among that part of the Russians, who reside in the Polish dominions, many of whom embraced the doctrine and rites of the Roman church in consequence of an association agreed on in the year 1596, in a meeting at *Bresty*, the capital of the Palatinate of *Cujavia*. Those that thus submitted to the communion of *Rome* were called the *United*, while the adverse party, who adhered to the doctrine and jurisdiction of the patriarch of *Constantinople* were distinguished by the title of the *Non-united* [l]. It is likewise farther worthy of observation here, that there has been established at *Kiovia*, since the fourteenth century, a congregation of Russians, subject to the jurisdiction of the Roman pontif, and ruled by its own *Metropolitans*, who are entirely distinct from the Russian bishops that reside in that city [m].

The votaries of *Rome* still less numerous among the Monophysites, Nestorians, and Armenians.

XXII. The Roman missionaries made scarcely any spiritual conquests worthy of mention among either the Asiatic or African *Monophysites*. About the middle of the preceding century, a little, insignificant church that acknowledged the jurisdiction of the Roman pontif, was erected among the Nestorians, whose patriarchs successively named JOSEPH [n], reside in the city of *Diarbek*. Some of the Armenian provinces embraced the doc-

[k] See the conferences between *Possevin* and the duke of *Moscow*, together with the other writings of this Jesuit, relative to the negotiation in question, that are subjoined to his work, called *Moscowia*.—See also *La Vie du P. Possevin*, par JEAN DORIGNY, livr. v. p. 351.

[l] ADR. REGENVOLSCHE Histor. Ecclesiar. Slavonicar. lib. iv. cap. ii. p. 465.

[m] See MICH. LEQUIEN *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 1274. & tom. iii. p. 1126.—*Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. Februar. p. 693.

[n] See ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. par. I. p. 615.—LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. ii. p. 1084.

trines and discipline of *Rome* so early as the fourteenth century, under the pontificate of JOHN XXII, who, in the year 1318, sent them a Dominican monk, to govern their church with the title and authority of an archbishop. The episcopal seat of this spiritual ruler was first fixed at *Adorbiana*, in the district of *Soldania* [o]; but was afterwards transferred to *Naxivan*, where it still remains in the hands of the Dominicans, who, alone, are admitted to that ghostly dignity [p]. The Armenian churches in *Poland*, who have embraced the faith of *Rome*, have also their bishop, who resides at *Lemberg* [q]. The Georgians and Mingrelians, who were visited by some monks of the Theatin and Capuchin orders, disgusted these missionaries by their ferocity and ignorance, remained inattentive to their counsels, and unmoved by their admonitions; so that their ministry and labours were scarcely attended with any visible fruit [r].

XXIII. The pompous accounts which the papal missionaries have given of the vast success of their labours among all these Grecian sects, are equally destitute of candour and truth. It is evident from testimonies, of the best and most respectable authority, that in some of these countries, they do nothing more than administer clandestine baptism to sick infants who are committed to their care, as they appear in the fictitious characters of physicians [s]; and that, in other places, the whole success of their ministry is confined to the gathering together some wretched tribes of indigent converts, whose poverty is the only bond of their attachment to the church of *Rome*, and who, when the papal largesses are suspended or withdrawn, fall from their pretended allegiance to *Rome*, and return to the religion of their ancestors [t]. It happens, also, from time to time, that a person of distinction among the Greeks or Orientals embraces the doctrine of the Latin church, and promises obedience to its pontif; nay, carries matters so far as to repair to *Rome* to testify his respectful submission to the apostolic see. But in these obsequious steps the noble converts are almost always moved by avarice or ambition; and, accordingly, when the face of their affairs changes, when they have obtained their purposes, and have nothing more to expect, then they, generally speaking, either suddenly abandon the church of *Rome*, or express their attachment to it in such ambiguous terms, as are only calculated to deceive. Those who, like the Nestorian bishop of *Diarbek* [u],

The labours of the Roman missionaries among all these sects produce little fruit.

[o] ODOR. RAYNALD. *Annal.* tom. xv. ad A. 1318, § iv.

[p] LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christian.* tom. iii. p. 1362 & 1403.—CLEMENS GALANUS, *Conciliatione Ecclesiæ Armenæ cum Romana*, tom. i. p. 527.

[q] *Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. iii. p. 54.

[r] URB. CERRI *Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 162.

[s] URB. CERRI *Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 164.—GABR. DE CHINON *Relations nouvelles du Levant*, par. I, c. vi. p. 174. This Capuchin monk delivers his opinions on many subjects with frankness and candour.

[t] See CHARDIN'S *Voyages en Perse*, tom. i. p. 186. tom. ii. p. 53. 75. 206. 271. 349. and principally tom. iii. p. 433. of the last edition published in *Holland* in 4^{to}, for in the former editions all the scandalous transactions of the Roman missionaries among the Armenians, Colchians, Iberians, and Persians are entirely wanting.—See also CHINON *Relations du Levant*, par. II. p. 308. which regards the Armenians; and MAILLET *Description d'Egypte*, tom. iii. p. 65. which is relative to the *Copts*.

[u] Otherwise named *Amida* and *Caramit*.

CENT. XVI. continue steadfast in the profession of the Roman faith, and even transmit it, with an appearance of zeal, to their posterity, are excited to this perseverance by no other motive than the uninterrupted liberality of the Roman pontif.

On the other hand, the bishops of Rome are extremely attentive and assiduous in employing all the methods in their power to maintain and extend their dominion among the Christians of the East. For this purpose, they treat, with the greatest lenity and indulgence, the proselytes they have made in these parts of the world, that their yoke may not appear intolerable. Nay, they carry this indulgence so far, as to shew evidently, that they are actuated, more by a love of power, than by an attachment to their own doctrines and institutions. For they do not only allow the Greek and other eastern proselytes the liberty of retaining, in their public worship, the rites and ceremonies of their ancestors (though in direct opposition with the religious service of the church of Rome) and of living in a manner repugnant to the customs and practice of the Latin world; but, what is much more surprizing, they suffer the peculiar doctrines, that distinguish the Greeks and Orientals from all other Christian societies, to remain in the public religious books of the proselytes already mentioned, and even to be reprinted at Rome in those that are sent abroad for their use [w]. The truth of the matter seems to be briefly this: That at Rome, a Greek, an Armenian, or a Copt, is looked upon as an obedient child, and a worthy member of the church, if he acknowledges the supreme and unlimited power of the Roman pontif over all the Christian world.

The Maronites.

XXIV. The *Maronites*, who inhabit the mounts *Libanus* and *Antilibanus*, date their subjection to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Roman pontif from the time that the Latins carried their hostile arms into *Palestine*, with a view to make themselves masters of the Holy land [x]. This subjection, however,

[w] ASSEMANI complains in many passages of his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* that even the very books that were printed at Rome for the use of the Nestorians, Jacobites, and Armenians, were not corrected, nor purged from the errors peculiar to these sects; and he looks upon this negligence, as the reason of the defection of many Roman converts, and of their return to the bosom of the eastern and Greek churches, to which they originally belonged.—See, on the other hand, the *Lettres Choïsies du R. Simon*, tom. ii. lett. xxiii. p. 156. in which this author pretends to defend this conduct of the Romans, which some attribute to indolence and neglect, others to artifice and prudence.

[x] The *Maronite* doctors, and more especially those that reside at Rome, maintain, with the greatest efforts of zeal and argument, that the religion of Rome has always been preserved among them, in its purity, and exempt from any mixture of heresy or error. The proof of this assertion has been attempted, with great labour and industry, by FAUST. NAIRON, in his *Dissertatio de origine, nomine, ac religione Maronitarum*, published in 8^{vo} at Rome, in the year 1679. It was from this treatise, and some other Maronite writers, that DE LA ROQUE drew the materials of his discourse concerning the origin of the Maronites, together with the abridgment of their history, which is inserted in the second volume of his *Voyage de Syrie et du Mont Liban*, p. 28, &c. But neither this hypothesis, nor the authorities by which it is supported, have any weight with the most learned men of the Roman church; who maintain, that the Maronites derived their origin from the *Monophysites*, and adhered to the doctrine of the *Monothelites**, until the twelfth century, when they embraced the communion of Rome. See R. SIMON, *Histoire Critique des Chrétiens Orientaux*, ch. xiii. p. 146.—EUSEB. RENAUDOT, *Histor. Patriarch. Alexand.* in *Præfat.* iii. 2.

* Those, who maintained, that notwithstanding the two natures in CHRIST, viz. the human and the divine, there was, nevertheless, but one will, which was the divine.

was agreed to, with this express condition, that neither the popes, nor their emissaries should pretend to change or abolish any thing that related to the ancient rites, moral precepts, or religious opinions of this people. So that, in reality, there is nothing to be found among the Maronites that favours of popery, if we except their attachment to the Roman pontif[y], who is obliged to pay very dear for their friendship. For as the Maronites live in the utmost distress of poverty under the tyrannical yoke of the Mahometans, the bishop of *Rome* is under a necessity of furnishing them with such subsidies as may appease the voracity of their oppressors, procure a subsistence for their bishop and clergy, provide all things that are requisite for the support of their churches, and the uninterrupted exercise of public worship, and contribute, in general, to lessen their misery. Besides; the college, erected at *Rome* by GREGORY XIII, with a design to instruct the young men, frequently sent from *Syria*, in the various branches of useful science and sacred erudition, and to prepossess them with an early veneration and attachment for the Roman pontif, is attended with a very considerable expence. The patriarch of the Maronites performs his spiritual functions at *Canobin*, a convent of the monks of St. ANTHONY, on mount *Libanus*, which is his constant residence. He claims the title of *Patriarch of Antioch*, and always assumes the name of PETER, as if he seemed desirous of being considered as the successor of that apostle [z].

in *Histor.* p. 49. The very learned ASSEMANI, who was himself a Maronite, steers a middle way between these two opposite accounts, in his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* tom. i. p. 496. while the matter in debate is left undecided by MICH. LEQUEN, in his *Oriens Christianus*, tom. iii. p. 1. where he gives an account of the Maronite church and its spiritual rulers.—For my own part, I am persuaded, that those who consider, that all the Maronites have not as yet embraced the faith, or acknowledged the jurisdiction, of *Rome*, will be little disposed to receive with credulity the assertions of certain Maronite priests, who are, after the manner of the Syrians, much addicted to boasting and exaggeration. Certain it is, that there are Maronites in *Syria* who still behold the church of *Rome* with the greatest aversion and abhorrence; nay, what is still more remarkable, great numbers of that nation residing in *Italy*, even under the eye of the pontif, opposed his authority during the last century, and threw the court of *Rome* into great perplexity. One body of these non-conforming Maronites retired into the vallies of *Piedmont*, where they joined the *Waldenses*; another, above six hundred in number, with a bishop and several ecclesiastics at their head, fled into *Corfica*, and implored the protection of the republic of *Genoa* against the violence of the *Inquisitors*. See URB. CERRI *Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 121, 122.—Now may it not be asked here, what could have excited the Maronites in *Italy* to this public and vigorous opposition to the Roman pontif, if it be true, that their opinions were in all respects conformable to the doctrines and decrees of the church of *Rome*? This opposition could not have been owing to any thing, but a difference in point of doctrine and belief; since the church of *Rome* allowed, and still allows, the Maronites, under its jurisdiction, to retain and perform the religious rites and institutions that have been handed down to them from their ancestors, and to follow the precepts and rules of life to which they have always been accustomed. Compare with the authors above-cited, *Thesaur. Epistol. Crozian.* tom. i. p. 11.

[y] The reader will do well to consult principally, on this subject, the observations subjoined by RICH. SIMON, to his French translation of the Italian Jesuit DANDINI's *Voyage to Mount Libanus*, published in 12^{mo} at *Paris*, in 1685.—See also EUSEB. RENAUDOT, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandr.* p. 548.

[z] See PETITQUEUX, *Voyage à Canobin dans le Mont Liban*, in the *Nouveaux Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. iv. p. 252. & tom. viii. p. 355.—LA ROQUE, *Voyage & Syrie*, tom. ii. p. 10.—LAUR. D'ARVIEUX, *Memoires ou Voyages*, tom. ii. p. 418.

PART II.

The History of the Modern Churches.

CHAPTER I.

The History of the LUTHERAN CHURCH.

CENT. XVI.

The commence-
ment of the Lu-
theran church.

I. **T**HE rise and progress of the *Evangelical*, or *Lutheran* church, have been already related, so far as they belonged to the History of the Reformation. The former of these titles was assumed by that church in consequence of the original design of its founders, which was to restore to its native lustre the *Gospel* of CHRIST, that had so long been covered with the darkness of superstition, or, in other words, to place in its proper and true light that important doctrine, which represents salvation as attainable by the merits of CHRIST alone. Nor did the church, now under consideration, discover any reluctance against adopting the name of the great man, whom providence employed as the honoured instrument of its foundation and establishment. A natural sentiment of gratitude to him, by whose ministry the clouds of superstition had been chiefly dispelled, who had destroyed the claims of pride and self-sufficiency, exposed the vanity of confidence in the intercession of saints and martyrs, and pointed out the son of God as the only proper object of trust to miserable mortals, excited his followers to assume his name, and to call their community, the *Lutheran* church.

The rise of this church must be dated from that remarkable period, when the pontif LEO X drove MARTIN LUTHER, with his friends and followers, from the bosom of the Roman hierarchy by a solemn and violent sentence of excommunication. It began to acquire a regular form and a considerable degree of stability and consistence from the year 1530, when the system of doctrine and morality, it had adopted, was drawn up and presented to the diet of *Augsburg*. And it was raised to the dignity of a lawful, and compleat hierarchy, totally independent on the laws and jurisdiction of the Roman pontif, in consequence of the treaty concluded at *Passau*, in the year 1552, between CHARLES V and MAURICE elector of *Saxony*, relating to the religious affairs of the empire.

The sum and
substance of its
religious doctrine.

II. The great and leading principle of the Lutheran church, is, that the Holy Scriptures are the only source from whence we are to draw our religious sentiments, whether they relate to faith or practice; and that these inspired writings are, in all matters that are essential to salvation, so plain, and so easy to be thoroughly understood, that their signification may be learned,

learned, without the aid of an expositor, by every person of common sense who has a competent knowledge of the language in which they are composed. There are, indeed, certain *formularies* adopted by this church, which contain the principal points of its doctrine, ranged, for the sake of method and perspicuity, in their natural order. But these books have no authority, but what they derive from the scriptures of truth, whose sense and meaning they are designed to convey; nor are the Lutheran doctors permitted to interpret or explain these books so as to draw from them any propositions that are inconsistent with the express declarations of the word of God. The chief and the most respectable of these human productions is the *Confession of Augsborg*, with the annexed *Defence* of it against the objections of the Roman-catholic doctors [a]. In the next rank may be placed the *Articles of Smalcald* [b], as they are commonly called, together with the shorter and larger *Catechisms* of LUTHER, designed for the instruction of youth, and the improvement of persons of riper years. To these standard-books most churches add the *Form of Concord*; which, though it be not universally received, has not, on that account, occasioned any animosity or disunion; as the few points, that prevent its being adopted by some churches, are of an

[(a) When the confession of *Augsburg* had been presented to the diet of that city, the Roman-catholic doctors were employed to refute the doctrines it contained; and this pretended refutation was also read to that august assembly. A reply was immediately drawn up by MELANCTHON, and presented to the emperor; who, under the pretext of a pacific spirit, refused to receive it. This reply was published afterwards under the title of *Apologia Confessionis Augustanae*; and is the defence of that confession, mentioned by Dr. MOSHEIM as annexed to it. To speak plain, MELANCTHON'S love of peace and concord seems to have carried him beyond what he owed to the truth, in composing this *Defence* of the confession of *Augsburg*. In the edition of that defence that some Lutherans (and CHYTHRÆUS among others) look upon as the most genuine and authentic, MELANCTHON makes several strange concessions to the church of *Rome*; whether through servile fear, excessive charity, or hesitation of mind, I will not pretend to determine. He speaks of the presence of CHRIST'S body in the eucharist in the very strongest terms that the Roman-catholics use to express the monstrous doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; and adopts those remarkable words of THEOPHYLACT, that *the bread was not a figure only, but was TRULY changed into flesh*. He approves of that canon of the mass, in which the priest prays that *the bread may be changed into the body of Christ*. It is true that, in some subsequent editions of the *defence* or *apology* now under consideration, these obnoxious passages were left out, and the phraseology, that had given such just offence, was considerably mitigated. There is an ample account of this whole matter, together with a history of the dissensions of the Lutheran church, in the valuable and learned work of HOSPINIAN, entitled, *Historiæ Sacramentariæ Pars Posterior*, p. 199, & seq.—These expressions, in MELANCTHON'S *Apologia*, will appear still more surprizing, when we recollect that, in the course of the debates concerning the manner of Christ's presence in the eucharist, he, at length, seemed to lean visibly towards the opinions of BUCER and CALVIN, and that, after his death, his followers were censured and persecuted in *Saxony* on this account, under the denomination of *Philippists*. This shews either, that the great man now under consideration changed his opinions, or, that he had formerly been seeking union and concord at the expence of truth.]

[(b) The *Articles*, here mentioned, were drawn up at *Smalcald* by LUTHER, on occasion of a meeting of the protestant electors, princes, and states at that place. They were principally designed to shew how far the *Lutherans* were disposed to go in order to avoid a final rupture, and in what sense they were willing to adopt the doctrine of Christ's presence in the eucharist. And though the terms in which these *articles* are expressed be somewhat dubious, yet they are much less harsh and disgusting than those used in the *Confession*, the *Apology*, and the *Form of Concord*.]

CENT. XVI. indifferent nature [c], and do not, in any degree, affect the grand and fundamental principles of true religion [d].

The ceremonies
and public wor-
ship of the Lu-
theran church.

III. The form of public worship, and the rites and ceremonies that were proper to be admitted as a part of it, gave rise to disputes in several places, during the infancy of the Lutheran church. Some were inclined to retain a greater number of the ceremonies and customs, that had been so excessively multiplied in the church of *Rome*, than seemed either lawful or expedient to others. The former, after the example of the Helvetic reformers, had their views entirely turned towards that simplicity and gravity that characterised the Christian worship in the primitive times; while the latter were of opinion, that some indulgence was to be shewn to the weakness of the multitude, and some regard paid to institutions that had acquired a certain degree of weight through long established custom. But as these contending parties were both persuaded that the ceremonial part of religion was, generally speaking, a matter of human institution, and that consequently a diversity of external rites might be admitted among different churches professing the same religion, without any prejudice to the bonds of charity and fraternal union, these disputes could not be of any long duration. In the mean time, all those ceremonies and observances of the church of *Rome*, whether of a public or private nature, that carried palpable marks of error and superstition, were, every where, rejected without hesitation; and wise precautions were used to regulate the forms of public worship in such a manner, that the genuine fruits of piety should not be choaked by a multitude of insignificant rites. Besides; every church was allowed the privilege of retaining so much of the ancient form of worship, as might be still observed without giving offence, and as seemed suited to the character of the people, the genius of the government, and the nature and circumstances of the place, where it was founded. Hence it has happened, that, even so far down as the present times, the Lutheran churches differ considerably, one from

[(c) Dr. MOSHEIM, like an artful painter, shades those objects in the history of Lutheranism, which it is impossible to expose with advantage to a full view. Of this nature was the conduct of the Lutheran doctors in the deliberations relating to the famous *Form of Concord* here mentioned; a conduct that discovered such an imperious and uncharitable spirit, as would have been more consistent with the genius of the court of *Rome* than with the principles of a protestant church. The reader, who is desirous of an ample demonstration of the truth and justice of this censure, has only to consult the learned work of ROD. HOSPINIAN, entitled, *Concordia Discors, seu de Origine et Progressu Formulæ Concordiæ Burgenfis*. The history of this remarkable production is more amply related in the thirty-ninth and following sections of this first chapter, and in the notes, which the translator has taken the liberty to add there, in order to cast a proper light upon some things that are too interesting to be viewed superficially. In the mean time I shall only observe, that the points in the *Form of Concord*, that prevented its being universally received, are not of such an indifferent nature as Dr. MOSHEIM seems to imagine. To maintain the ubiquity, or omnipresence of CHRIST's body, together with its real and peculiar presence in the eucharist, and to exclude from their communion the protestants, who denied these palpable absurdities, was the plan of the Lutheran doctors in composing and recommending the *Form of Concord*; and this plan can neither be looked upon as a matter of pure indifference, nor as a mark of christian charity. But for a farther proof of this, see § xxxix, already referred to.]

[d] See, for an account of the Lutheran confessions of faith, CHRIST. KOCKERI *Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbolicæ*, p. 114.

the other, with respect both to the number and nature of their religious ceremonies; a circumstance so far from tending to their dishonour, that it is, on the contrary, a very striking proof of their wisdom and moderation [e].

IV. The supreme civil rulers of every Lutheran state are clothed also with the dignity, and perform the functions of supremacy in the church. The very essence of civil government seems manifestly to point out the necessity of investing the sovereign with this spiritual supremacy [f], and the tacit consent of the Lutheran churches has confirmed the dictates of wise policy in this respect. It must not, however, be imagined, that the ancient rights and privileges of the people in ecclesiastical affairs have been totally abolished by this constitution of things; since it is certain, that the vestiges of the authority exercised by them in the primitive times, though more striking in one place than in another, are yet more or less visible every where. Besides, it must be carefully remembered, that all civil rulers of the Lutheran persuasion are effectually restrained, by the fundamental principles of the doctrine they profess, from any attempts to change or destroy the established rule of faith and manners, to make any alteration in the essential doctrines of their religion, or in any thing that is intimately connected with them, or to impose their particular opinions upon their subjects in a despotic and arbitrary manner.

Concerning the visible head, and the form of government of the Lutheran church.

The councils, or societies, appointed by the sovereign to watch over the interests of the church, and to govern and direct its affairs, are composed of persons versed in the knowledge both of civil and ecclesiastical law, and, according to a very ancient denomination, are called *Consistories*. The internal government of the Lutheran church seems equally removed from *episcopacy* on the one hand, and from *presbyterianism* on the other, if we except the kingdoms of *Sweden* and *Denmark*, who retain the form of ecclesiastical government that preceded the reformation, purged, indeed, from the superstitions and abuses that rendered it so odious [g]. This constitution of the Lutheran hierarchy will not seem surprizing, when the sentiments of that people, with respect to ecclesiastical polity, are duly considered. On the one hand, they are persuaded, that there is no law, of divine authority, which points out a distinction between the ministers of the gospel with respect to rank, dignity, or prerogatives; and therefore they recede from

[e] See BALTH. MEISNERUS *Lib. de Legibus*, lib. iv. art. iv. quæst. iv. p. 662—666.—JO. ADAM SCHERZERUS, *Breviar. Hülfemann Enucl.* p. 1313—1321.

[(f)] Since nothing is more inconsistent with that subordination and concord, which are among the great ends of civil government, than *imperium in imperio*, i. e. two independent sovereignties in the same *body politic*. Hence the genius of government, as well as the spirit of genuine Christianity, proclaims the equity of that constitution, that makes the supreme head of the state, the supreme visible ruler of the church.]

[(g)] In these two kingdoms the church is ruled by *bishops* and *superintendents* under the inspection and authority of the sovereign. The archbishop of *Upsal* is primate of *Sweden*, and the only archbishop among the Lutherans. The luxury and licentiousness, that too commonly flow from the opulence of the Roman-catholic clergy, are unknown in these two northern states; since the revenues of the prelate now mentioned do not amount to more than 400 pounds yearly, while those of the bishops are proportionably small.]

CENT. XVI. *episcopacy*. But, on the other hand, they are of opinion, that a certain subordination, a diversity in point of rank and privileges among the clergy, are not only highly useful, but also necessary to the perfection of church communion, by connecting, in consequence of a mutual dependence, more closely together the members of the same body; and thus they avoid the uniformity of the *presbyterian* government. They are not, however, agreed with respect to the extent of this subordination, and the degrees of superiority and precedence that ought to distinguish their doctors; for in some places this is regulated with much more regard to the ancient rules of church government, than is discovered in others. As the divine law is silent on this head, different opinions may be entertained, and different forms of ecclesiastical polity adopted, without a breach of Christian charity and fraternal union.

The Lutheran
liturgies, their
public worship
and their method
of instructing.

V. Every country has its own *Liturgies*, which are the rules of proceeding in every thing that relates to external worship and the public exercise of religion. These rules, however, are not of an immutable nature, like those institutions which bear the stamp of a divine authority, but may be augmented, corrected, or illustrated by the order of the sovereign, when such changes appear evidently to be necessary or expedient. The liturgies, used in the different countries that have embraced the system of LUTHER, agree perfectly in all the essential branches of religion, in all matters that can be looked upon as of real moment and importance; but they differ widely in many things of an indifferent nature, concerning which the Holy Scriptures are silent, and which compose that part of the public religion that derives its authority from the wisdom and appointment of men. Assemblies for the celebration of divine worship meet every where at stated times. Here the Holy Scriptures are read publicly, prayers and hymns are addressed to the Deity, the sacraments are administered, and the people are instructed in the knowledge of religion, and excited to the practice of virtue by the discourses of their ministers. The wisest methods are used for the religious education of youth, who are not only carefully instructed in the elements of Christianity in the public schools, but are also examined, by the pastors of the churches to which they belong, in a public manner, in order to the farther improvement of their knowledge and the more vigorous exertion of their faculties in the study of divine truth. Hence, in almost every province, *Catechisms*, which contain the essential truths of religion and the main precepts of morality, are published and recommended by the authority of the sovereign, as rules to be followed by the masters of schools and by the ministers of the church, both in their private and public instructions. But as LUTHER left behind him an accurate and judicious production of this kind, in which the fundamental principles of religion and morality are explained and confirmed with the greatest perspicuity and force both of evidence and expression, this compendious *Catechism* of that eminent reformer is universally adopted as the first introduction to religious knowledge, and is one of the *standard-books* of the church which bears his name. And, indeed, all the provincial catechisms are no more than

than illustrations and enlargements on this excellent abridgement of faith and practice. CENT. XVI.

VI. Among the days that are held sacred in the Lutheran church (besides that which is celebrated, every week, in memory of CHRIST's resurrection from the dead) we may reckon all such as were signalized by those glorious and important events, that proclaim the celestial mission of the Saviour, and the divine authority of his holy religion [b]. These sacred festivals, the grateful and well-grounded piety of ancient times had always held in the highest veneration. But the Lutheran church has gone yet farther; and, to avoid giving offence to weak brethren, has retained several which seem to have derived the respect that is paid to them, rather from the suggestions of superstition than from the dictates of true religion. There are some churches, who carry the desire of multiplying festivals so far, as to observe religiously the days that were formerly set apart for celebrating the memory of the *Twelve Apostles*.

The holidays, and ecclesiastical discipline of the Lutheran church.

It is well known that the power of *excommunication*, i. e. of banishing from its bosom obstinate and scandalous transgressors, was a privilege enjoyed and exercised by the church from the remotest antiquity; and it is no less certain, that this privilege was perverted often to the most iniquitous and odious purposes. The founders, therefore, of the Lutheran church undertook to remove the abuses and corruptions under which this branch of ecclesiastical discipline laboured, and to restore it to its primitive purity and vigour. At first their attempt seemed to be crowned with success; since it is plain, that, during the sixteenth century, no opposition of any moment was made to the wise and moderate exercise of this spiritual authority. But in process of time this privilege fell imperceptibly into contempt; the terror of excommunication lost its force, and ecclesiastical discipline was reduced to such a shadow, that, in most places, there are scarcely any remains, any traces of it, to be seen at this day. This change may be attributed partly to the corrupt propensities of mankind, who are naturally desirous of destroying the influence of every institution that is designed to curb their licentious passions. It must, however, be acknowledged, that this relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline was not owing to this cause alone; other circumstances concurred to diminish the respect and submission that had been paid to the spiritual tribunal. On the one hand, the clergy abused this important privilege in various ways; some misapplying the severity of excommunication through ignorance or imprudence, while others, still more impiously, perverted an institution in itself extremely useful, to satisfy their private resentments, and to avenge themselves of those who had dared to offend them. On the other hand, the counsels of certain persons in power, who considered the privilege of excommunicating in the hands of the clergy, as derogatory from the majesty of the sovereign, and detrimental to the interests of civil society, had no small influence in bring-

[(b) Such (for example) are the *nativity*, *death*, *resurrection*, and *ascension* of the son of God; the descent of the holy Spirit upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost, &c.]

CH. XVI.

ing this branch of ghostly jurisdiction into disrepute. It is however certain, that, whatever causes may have contributed to produce this effect, the effect itself was much to be lamented; as it removed one of the most powerful restraints upon iniquity. Nor will it appear surprizing, when this is duly considered, that the manners of the Lutherans are so remarkably depraved, and that in a church that is deprived almost of all authority and discipline, multitudes affront the public by their audacious irregularities, and transgress, with a frontless impudence, through the prospect of impunity.

Of the prosperous
and calamitous
events that have
happened to the
Lutheran church.

VII. The prosperous and unfavourable events that belong to the history of the Lutheran church, since the happy establishment of its liberty and independence, are neither numerous nor remarkable, and may consequently be mentioned in a few words. The rise and progress of this church, before its final and permanent establishment, have been already related; but that very religious peace, which was the instrument of its stability and independence, set bounds, at the same time, to its progress in the empire, and prevented it effectually from extending its limits [i]. Towards the conclusion of this century, GEBHARD, archbishop of *Cologne*, discovered a propensity to enter into its communion, and, having contracted the bonds of matrimony, formed the design of introducing the reformation into his dominions. But this arduous attempt, which was in direct contradiction with the famous *Ecclesiastical Reservation* [k] stipulated in the articles of the peace of religion concluded at *Augsburg*, proved abortive, and the prelate was obliged to resign his dignity and to abandon his country [l]. On the other hand, it is certain, that the adversaries of the Lutheran church were not permitted to disturb its tranquillity, or to hurt, in any essential point, its liberty, prosperity, and independence. Their intentions, indeed, were malignant enough; and it appeared evident, from many striking circumstances, that they were secretly projecting a new attack upon the protestants, with a view to annul the treaty of *Passau*, which had been confirmed at *Augsburg*, and to have them declared public enemies to the empire. Such was undoubtedly the unjust and seditious design of FRANCIS BURCKHARD, in composing the famous book *Deo Autonomia*, which was published in the year 1586; and also of PISTORIUS, in drawing up the *Reasons*, which the marquis of BADE alledged in vindication of his returning back from Lutheranism into the bosom of popery [m]. These writers, and others of

[i] The reason of this will be seen in the following note.]

[k] In the diet of *Augsburg*, which was assembled in the year 1555, in order to execute the treaty of *Passau*, the several states, that had already embraced the Lutheran religion, were confirmed in the full enjoyment of their religious liberty. To prevent, however, as far as was possible, the farther progress of the reformation, CHARLES V stipulated for the catholics the famous *Ecclesiastical Reservation*; by which it was decreed, that if any archbishop, prelate, bishop, or other ecclesiastic should, in time to come, renounce the faith of *Rome*, his dignity and benefice should be forfeited, and his place be filled by the chapter or college, possessed of the power of election.]

[l] See JO. DAV. KÖLERI *Dissertatio de Gebhardo Truchsessio*.—JO. PET. à LUDEWIG *Reliquia M Storum omnis ævi*, tom. v. p. 383.—See also a German work, entitled, *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, A. 1748, p. 484.

[m] See CHR. AUG. SALIG, *Histor. August. Confession*. tom. i. lib. iv. cap. iii. p. 767.

the

the same stamp, treat the *Religious Peace*, negotiated at *Passau*, and ratified at *Augsburg*, as unjust, because obtained by force of arms, and as null, because concluded without the knowledge and consent of the Roman pontif. They pretend also to prove, that by the changes and interpolations, which they affirm to have been made by MELANCTHON, in the confession of *Augsburg*, after it had been presented to the diet, the protestants forfeited all the privileges and advantages that they derived from the treaty now mentioned. This latter accusation gave rise to long and warm debates during this and the following century. Many learned and ingenious productions were published on that occasion, in which the Lutheran divines proved, with the utmost perspicuity and force of argument, that the Confession of *Augsburg* was preserved in their church in its first state, uncorrupted by any mixture, and that none of their brethren had ever departed in any instance from the doctrines it contains [n]. They, that felt most sensibly the bitter and implacable hatred of the papists against the doctrine and worship of the Lutheran church (which they disdainfully called the *new religion*) were the members of that church who lived in the territories of Roman-catholic princes. This is more especially true of the protestant subjects of the house of *Austria* [o], who have experienced, in the most affecting manner, the dire effects of bigotry and superstition seated on a throne, and who lost the greatest part of their liberty before the conclusion of this century.

CENT. XVI.

VIII. While the votaries of *Rome* were thus meditating the ruin of the Lutheran church, and exerting, for this purpose, all the powers of secret artifice and open violence, the followers of LUTHER were assiduously bent on defeating their efforts, and left no means unemployed, that seemed proper to maintain their own doctrine and to strengthen their cause. The calamities they had suffered were fresh in their remembrance; and hence they were admonished to use all possible precautions to prevent their falling again into the like unhappy circumstances. Add to this, the zeal of princes and men in power for the advancement of true religion, which it must be acknowledged was much greater in this century, than it is in the times in which we live. Hence the original confederacy, that had been formed among the German princes for the maintenance of Lutheranism, and of which the elector of *Saxony* was the chief, gained new strength from day to day, and foreign sovereigns, particularly those of *Sweden* and *Denmark*, were invited to enter into this grand alliance. And as it was uni-

The state of learning among the Lutherans.

[n] See SALIC, *Hist. August. Confessionis*, tom. i.—It cannot indeed be denied, that MELANCTHON corrected and altered some passages of the Confession of *Augsburg*. Nay more; it is certain, that, in the year 1555, he made use of the extraordinary credit and influence he then had, to introduce among the Saxon churches an edition of that Confession, which was not only corrected in several places, but was, moreover, upon the whole very different from the original one. But his conduct in this step, which was extremely audacious, or at least highly imprudent, never received the approbation of the Lutheran church, nor was the *Augsburg* Confession, in this new shape, ever admitted as one of the standard-books of its faith and doctrine.

[o] See the *Austria Evangelica* of the learned RAUPACHIUS, tom. i. p. 152. tom. ii. p. 287. This work is composed in the German language.

CENT. XVI.

versally agreed, that the stability and lustre of the rising church depended much on the learning of its ministers, and the progress of the sciences among those, in general, who professed its doctrines, so the greatest part of the confederate princes promoted, with the greatest zeal, the culture of letters, and banished, wherever their salutary influence could extend, that baneful ignorance, that is the mother of superstition. The academies founded by the Lutherans at *Jena*, *Helmstadt*, and *Altorf*, and by the Calvinists at *Franeker*, *Leyden*, and other places, the ancient universities reformed and accommodated to the constitution and exigencies of a purer church than that under whose influence they had been at first established; the great number of schools that were opened in every city; the ample rewards, together with the distinguished honours and privileges, that were bestowed on men of learning and genius; all these circumstances bear honourable testimony to the generous zeal of the German princes for the advancement of useful knowledge. These noble establishments were undoubtedly expensive, and required large funds for their support. These were principally drawn from the revenues and possessions, which the piety or superstition of ancient times had consecrated to the multiplication of convents, the erection or embellishment of churches, and other religious uses.

The study of
Belles Lettres
and languages
promoted.

IX. These generous and zealous efforts in the cause of learning were attended with remarkable success. Almost all the liberal arts and sciences were cultivated with emulation, and brought to greater degrees of perfection. All those, whose views were turned to the service of the church, were obliged to apply themselves, with diligence and assiduity, to the study of Greek, Hebrew, and Latin literature, in order to qualify them for performing, with dignity and success, the duties of the sacred function; and it is well known, that in these branches of erudition several Lutheran doctors excelled in such a manner as to acquire a deathless name in the republic of letters. MELANTHON, CARIO, CHYTRÆUS, REINECCIUS, and others were eminent for their knowledge of history. More particularly FLACIUS, one of the authors of the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses* (that immortal work, which restored to the light of evidence and truth the facts relating to the rise and progress of the Christian church, which had been covered with thick darkness, and corrupted by innumerable fables) may be deservedly considered as the parent of ecclesiastical history. Nor should we omit mentioning the learned MARTIN CHEMNITZ, to whose *Examination of the Decrees of the Council of Trent*, the history of religion is more indebted, than many, at this day, are apt to imagine. While so many branches of learning were cultivated with zeal, some it must be confessed, were too little pursued. Among these we may place the history of literature and philosophy; the important science of criticism; the study of antiquities; and other objects of erudition that stand in connexion with them. It is, however, to be observed, that notwithstanding the neglect, with which these branches of science seemed, too generally, to be treated, the foundations of their culture and improvement in future ages were really laid in

in this century. On the other hand, it is remarkable that Latin eloquence and poetry were carried to a very high degree of improvement, and exhibited orators and poets of the first order; from which circumstance alone it may be fairly concluded, that, if all the branches of literature and philosophy were not brought to that pitch of perfection of which they were susceptible, this was not owing to the want of industry or genius, but rather to the restraints laid upon genius by the infelicity of the times. All the votaries of science, whom a noble emulation excited to the pursuit of literary fame, were greatly animated by the example, the influence, and the instructions of MELANCTHON, who was deservedly considered as the great and leading doctor of the Lutheran church, and whose sentiments, relating both to sacred and profane erudition, were so universally respected, that scarcely any had the courage to oppose them. In the next rank to this eminent reformer may be mentioned JOACHIM CAMERARIUS of *Leipfic*, a shining ornament to the republic of letters in this century, who, by his zeal and application, contributed much to promote the cause of universal learning, and more especially the study of the elegant literature.

X. The revolutions of philosophy among the Lutheran doctors were many and various. LUTHER and MELANCTHON seemed to set out with a resolution to banish every species of philosophy [p] from the church; and though it is impossible to justify entirely this part of their conduct, yet they are less to be blamed than those scholastic doctors, whose barbarous method of teaching philosophy, was inexpressibly disgusting, and who, by a miserable abuse of the subtle precepts of ARISTOTLE, had perverted the dictates of common sense and introduced the greatest obscurity and confusion both into philosophy and religion. But though these abuses led the two great men, now mentioned, too far, and were carrying them into the opposite extreme; yet their own recollection suspended their precipitation, and they both perceived before it was too late, that true philosophy was necessary to restrain the licentious flights of mere genius and fancy, and to guard the sanctuary of religion against the inroads of superstition and enthusiasm [q]. It was in consequence of this persuasion that MELANCTHON composed in a plain and familiar style, abridgments of almost all the various branches of philosophy, which, during many years, were explained publicly to the studious youth in all the Lutheran academies and schools of learning. This celebrated reformer may not improperly be considered as an *eclectic*; for though in many points he followed ARISTOTLE, and retained some degree of propensity to the ancient philosophy of the schools, yet

The various fate
of philosophy
among the Lu-
therans.

[p] See CHRIST. AUG. HEUMANNI *Acta Philosophor.* art. ii. part. X. p. 579.—JO. HERM. AB ELSWICH, *Dissertat. de varia Aristotelis fortuna in Scholis Protestantium*, which LAUNOY has prefixed to his book *De fortuna Aristotelis in Academia Parisiensi*, § viii. p. 15. § xiii. p. 36.

[(q) Some writers, either through malignity or for want of better information, have pretended that LUTHER rejected the scholastic philosophy through a total ignorance of its nature and precepts. Such as venture upon such an assertion must be themselves grossly ignorant of the History of Literature in general, as well as of the industry and erudition of LUTHER in particular. For a demonstrative proof of this, see BRÜCKERI *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*, tom. iv. part. 1. p. 94, 95, 96, &c.]

CENT. XVI. he drew many things from the facundity of his own genius, and had often recourse also to the doctrines of the Platonics and Stoics.

Philosophical
sects—
Aristotelians and
Ramæane.

XI. This method of teaching philosophy, however recommendable on account of its simplicity and perspicuity, did not long enjoy, alone and unrivalled, the great credit and authority it had obtained. Certain acute and subtle doctors, having perceived that MELANCTHON, in composing his *Abridgments*, had discovered a peculiar and predominant attachment to the philosophy of ARISTOTLE, thought it was better to go to the source, than to drink at the stream; and therefore read and explained to their disciples the works of the Stagirite. On the other hand, it was observed, that the Jesuits and other votaries of Rome artfully made use of the ambiguous terms and the intricate sophistry of the ancient schoolmen, in order to puzzle the protestants, and to reduce them to silence, when they wanted such arguments, as were adapted to produce conviction. And, therefore, many protestant doctors thought it might be advantageous to their cause to have the studious youth instructed in the mysteries of the Aristotelian philosophy, as it was taught in the schools, that thus they might be qualified to defend themselves with the same weapons with which they were attacked. Hence there arose, towards the conclusion of this century, three philosophical sects, the *Melancthonian*, the *Aristotelian*, and the *Scholastic*. The first declined gradually and soon disappeared; while the other two imperceptibly grew into one, and acquiring new vigour by this coalition, increased daily in reputation and influence, and were adopted in all the schools of learning. It is true, the followers of RAMUS made violent inroads, in several places, upon the territories of these combined sects, and sometimes with a certain appearance of success; but their hopes were transitory; for after various struggles they were obliged to yield, and were, at length, entirely banished from the schools [r].

The Paracelsists,
or Fire-philosophers.

XII. Such also was the fate of the disciples of PARACELsus, who, from the grand principle of their physical system, were called *Fire-philosophers* [s], and who aimed at nothing less than the total subversion of the peripatetic philosophy, and the introduction of their own reveries into the public schools. Towards the conclusion of this century the Paracelsists really made a figure in almost all the countries of Europe, as their sect was patronised and supported by the genius and eloquence of several great men, who exerted themselves with the utmost zeal and assiduity in its cause, and endeavoured, both by their writings and their transactions, to augment its

[r] JO. HERM. AB ELSWICH, *De fatis Aristot. in Scholis Protest.* § xxi. p. 54.—JO. GEORG. WALCHIUS, *Historia Logices*, lib. ii. cap. i. § iii. v. in *Parergis Academicis*, p. 613. 617.—OTTO FRID. SCHUTZIUS, *De vita Chytræi*, lib. iv. § iv. p. 19.

[(s) This fanatical sect of philosophers had several denominations. They were called *Theosophists*, from their declaiming against *human reason* as a dangerous and deceitful guide, and their representing a *divine and supernatural illumination* as the only means of arriving at truth. They were called *Philosophi per ignem*, i. e. *Fire-philosophers*, from their maintaining that the intimate essences of natural things were only to be known by the trying efforts of *fire*, directed in a chemical process. They were, lastly, denominated *Paracelsists*, from the eminent physician and chemist of that name, who was the chief ornament and leader of that extraordinary sect.]

credit. In *England* it found an eminent defender in M. ROBERT FLOOD, CENT. XVI. or FLUDD, a man of a very singular genius [t], who illustrated, or, at least, attempted to illustrate, the philosophy of PARACELSUS, in a great number of treatises, which, even in our times, are not entirely destitute of readers and admirers. The same philosophy got a certain footing in *France*, had several votaries in that kingdom, and was propagated with zeal at *Paris*, by a person whose name was RIVIER, in opposition to the sentiments and efforts of the university of that city [u]. Its cause was industriously promoted in *Denmark* by SEVERINUS [w]; in *Germany* by KUNRATH, an eminent physician at *Dresden*, who died in the year 1605 [x]; and in other countries by a considerable number of warm votaries, who were by no means unsuccessful in augmenting its reputation and multiplying its followers. As all these heralds of the new philosophy accompanied their instructions with a striking air of piety and devotion, and seemed, in propagating their strange system, to propose to themselves no other end than the advancement of the divine glory, and the restoration of peace and concord in a divided church; a motive, in appearance, so generous and noble could not fail to procure them friends and protectors. Accordingly we find, that towards the conclusion of this century, several persons, eminent for their piety and distinguished by their zeal for the advancement of true religion, joined themselves to this sect. Of this number were the Lutheran doctors WEIGELIUS, ARNDIUS, and others, who were led into the snare by their ill-grounded notions of human reason, and who apprehended that controversy and argumentation might lead men to substitute anew the pompous and intricate jargon of the schools in the place of solid and sincere piety.

XIII. Among those that discovered a propensity towards the system of the Paracelsists, or Theosophists, was the celebrated DANIEL HOFMANN, Professor of Divinity in the university of *Helmstadt*, who, from the year 1598, had declared open war against philosophy, and who continued to oppose it with the greatest obstinacy and violence. Laying hold of some particular opinions of LUTHER, and certain passages in the writings of that great man, he extravagantly maintained that philosophy was the mortal enemy of religion; that *truth* was divisible into two branches, the one *philosophical* and the other *theological*; and that what was *true* in philosophy, was *false* in theology. These absurd and pernicious tenets naturally alarmed the judicious doctors of the university, and excited a warm controversy between HOFMANN and his colleagues OWEN GUNTHERUS, CORNELIUS MARTIN, JOHN CASELIUS, and DUNCAN LIDDEL; a controversy also of too much consequence to be confined within such narrow bounds, and which, accord-

The controversy
between Hof-
mann and his
colleagues.

[(t) The person here mentioned by Dr. MOSHELM is not the famous Dominican monk of that name, who, from his ardent pursuit of mathematical knowledge, was called the *Seeker*, and who, from his passion for chemistry, was suspected of magic, but a famous physician born in the year 1574, at *Milgate* in *Kent*, and very remarkable for his attachment to the alchemists. See ANT. WOOD, *Athenar. Oxoniens.* vol. i. p. 610. & *Hist. et Antiquit. Acad. Oxoniens.* lib. ii. p. 390.—P. GASSENDI *Examen Philosoph. Fluddanæ*, tom. iii. Opp. p. 259.]

[u] BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. vi. p. 327, & *passim*.

[w] JO. MOLLERI *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. i. p. 623.

[x] JO. MOLLERI *ibid.* tom. ii. p. 440.

ingly,

CENT. XVI. ingly, was carried on in other countries with the same fervor. The tumults it excited in *Germany* were appeased by the interposition of HENRY JULIUS, duke of *Brunswick*, who having made a careful inquiry into the nature of this debate, and consulted the professors of the academy of *Rostoc* on that subject, commanded HOFMANN to retract publicly the invectives he had thrown out against philosophy in his writings and in his academical lectures, and to acknowledge, in the most open manner, the harmony and union of sound philosophy with true and genuine theology [y].

The science of
theology correct-
ed and improved.

XIV. The theological system, that now prevails in the Lutheran academies, is not of the same tenour or spirit with that which was adopted in the infancy of the reformation. As time and experience are necessary to bring all things to perfection, so the doctrine of the Lutheran church changed, imperceptibly and by degrees, its original form, and was improved and perfected in many respects. This will appear both evident and striking to those, who are acquainted with the history of the doctrines relating to the interpretation of scripture, free-will, predestination, and other points, and who compare the Lutheran systems of divinity of an earlier date with those that have been composed in modern times. The case could not well be otherwise. The glorious defenders of religious liberty, to whom we owe the various blessings of the reformation, as they were conducted only by the suggestions of their natural sagacity, whose advances in the pursuit of knowledge are gradual and progressive, could not, at once, behold the truth in all its lustre, and in all its extent, but, as usually happens to persons that have been long accustomed to the darkness of ignorance, their approaches towards knowledge were but slow, and their views of things but imperfect. The Lutherans were greatly assisted both in correcting and illustrating the articles of their faith partly by the controversies they were obliged to carry on with the Roman-catholic doctors, and the disciples of ZWINGLE, and CALVIN, and partly by the intestine divisions that reigned among themselves, of which an account shall be given in this chapter. They have been absurdly reproached, on account of this variation in their doctrine, by BOSSUET and other papal writers, who did not consider that the founders of the Lutheran church never pretended to divine inspiration; and that it is by discovering first the errors of others, that the wise generally prepare themselves for the investigation of truth.

The state of
exegetic theology.

XV. The first and principal object, that drew the attention and employed the industry of the reformers, was the exposition and illustration of the sacred writings, which, according to the doctrine of the Lutheran church, contain all the treasures of celestial wisdom; all things that relate to faith and practice. Hence it happened, that the number of commentators and expositors among the Lutherans was equal to that of the eminent and

[y] There is an accurate account of this controversy, with an enumeration of the writings published on both sides of the question, in the *Life of Owen Guntherus*, which is inserted by MOLLERUS, in his *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. i. p. 225.—See also JO. HERM. AB ELSWICH, *De fatis Aristotelis in Scholis Protestant.* § xxvii. p. 76.—And a German work, entitled, GOTTER ARNOLD, *Kirchen und Ketzer-Historie*, p. 947.

learned doctors that adorned that communion. At the head of them all, CENT. XVI. LUTHER and MELANCTHON are undoubtedly to be placed; the former on account of the sagacity and learning discovered in his explications of several portions of scripture, and particularly of the Books of MOSES; and the latter in consequence of his commentaries on the Epistles of St. PAUL, and other learned labours of that kind, which are abundantly known. A second class of expositors, of the same communion, obtained also great applause in the learned world by their successful application to the study of the Holy Scriptures, in which we may rank MATTHIAS FLACIUS, whose *Glossary and Key to the sacred writings* [z], is extremely useful in unfolding the meaning of the inspired penmen; JOHN BUGENHAGIUS, JUSTUS JONAS, ANDREW OSIANDER, and MARTIN CHEMNITZ, whose *Harmonies of the Evangelists* are not void of merit. To these we may add VICTOR STRIGELIUS and JOACHIM CAMERARIUS, of whom the latter, in his *Commentary on the New Testament*, expounds the scriptures in a grammatical and critical manner only; and, leaving aside all debated points of doctrine and religious controversy, unfolds the sense of each term and the spirit of each phrase by the rules of criticism and the genius of the ancient languages, in which he was a very uncommon proficient.

XVI. All these expositors and commentators abandoned the method of the ancient interpreters, who, neglecting the plain and evident purport of the words of scripture, were perpetually torturing their imaginations, in order to find out a mysterious sense in each word or sentence, or were hunting after insipid allusions and chimerical applications of scripture-passages to objects, which never entered into the views of the inspired writers. On the contrary, their principal zeal and industry were employed in investigating the natural force and signification of each expression, in consequence of that golden rule of interpretation inculcated by LUTHER, *That there is no more than one sense annexed to the words of scripture throughout all the Books of the Old and New Testament* [a]. It must, however, be acknowledged, that the examples exhibited by these judicious expositors were far from being universally followed. Many, labouring under the old and inveterate disease of an irregular fancy and a scanty judgment, were still seeking for hidden significations and double meanings in the expressions of Holy writ. They were perpetually busied in twisting all the prophecies of the Old Testament into an intimate connexion with the life, sufferings, and transactions of JESUS CHRIST; and were over-sagacious in finding out, in the history of the patriarchal and Jewish churches, the types and figures of the events that have happened in modern, and that may yet happen in future, times. In all this they discovered more imagination than judgment; more wit than wisdom. Be that as it may, all the expositors of this age may be divided, methinks with propriety enough, into two classes, with LUTHER at the head of the one, and MELANCTHON presiding in the

The respective merits of the sacred interpreters.

[z] The Latin titles are *Glossa Scripturae Sacrae*, and *Clavis Scripturae Sacrae*.

[(a) This golden rule will be found often defective and false, unless, several prophetic, parabolical, and figurative expressions be excepted in its application.]

other.

Concerning the
didactic theology
or doctrine of
the Lutheran
church.

other. Some commentators followed the example of the former, who, after a plain and familiar explication of the sense of scripture, applied its decisions to the fixing of controverted points, and to the illustration of the doctrines and duties of religion. Others discovered a greater propensity to the method of the latter, who first divided the discourses of the sacred writers into several parts, explained them according to the rules of rhetoric, and afterwards proceeded to a more strict and almost a literal exposition of each part, taken separately, applying the result, as rarely as was possible, to points of doctrine or matters of controversy.

XVII. Compleat systems of theology were far from being numerous in this century. MELANCTHON, the most eminent of all the Lutheran doctors, collected and digested the doctrines of the church, which he so eminently adorned, into a dody of divinity, under the vague title of *Loci Communes*, i. e. *A Common Place Book of Theology*. This compilation, which was afterwards, at different times, reviewed, corrected, and enlarged by its author, was in such high repute, during this century, and even in succeeding times, that it was considered as an universal model of doctrine for all those, who either instructed the people by their public discourses, or promoted the knowledge of religion by their writings [b]. The title, prefixed to this performance, indicates sufficiently the method, or rather the irregularity, that reigns in the arrangement of its materials; and shews that it was not the design of MELANCTHON to place the various truths of religion in that systematical concatenation and that scientific order and connexion, that are observed by the philosophers in their demonstrations and discourses, but to propose them with freedom and simplicity, as they presented themselves to his view. Accordingly, in the first editions of the book under consideration, the method observed, both in delineating and illustrating these important truths, is extremely plain, and is neither loaded with the terms, the definitions, nor the distinctions that abound in the writings of the philosophers. Thus did the Lutheran doctors, in the first period of the rising church, renounce and avoid, in imitation of the great reformer whose name they bear, all the abstruse reasoning and subtle discussions of the scholastic doctors. But the sophistry of their adversaries, and their perpetual debates with the artful champions of the church of Rome, engaged them by degrees, as has been already observed, to change their language and their methods of reasoning; so that, in process of time, the simplicity, that had reigned in their theological systems and in their manner of explaining the truths of religion, almost totally disappeared. Even MELANCTHON, himself, fell imperceptibly into this new method, or rather into the old method revived, and enlarged the subsequent editions of his *Loci Communes*, by the addition of several philosophical illustrations designed to expose the fallacious reasonings of the Roman-catholic doctors. As yet, however, the discussions of philosophy were but sparingly used, and the unintelligible jargon of the schoolmen was kept at a certain distance, and seldom borrowed. But when the founders of the Lutheran church were removed by death, and the

[b] See JO. FRANC. BUCCEUS, *Isagoge ad Theologiam*, lib. ii. cap. i. § xiii. tom. i. p. 381.

Jesuits attacked the principles of the reformation with redoubled animosity, CENT. XVI. armed with the intricate and perplexing dialectic of the schools; then, indeed, the scene changed, and theology assumed another aspect. The stratagem employed by the Jesuits corrupted our doctors, induced them to revive that intricate and abstruse manner of defending and illustrating religious truth, that LUTHER and his associates had rejected, and to introduce, into the plain and straight paths of theology, all the thorns and thistles, all the dark, and devious labyrinths of the scholastic philosophy. This unhappy change was deeply lamented by several divines of eminent piety and learning about the commencement of the seventeenth century, who regretted the loss of that amiable simplicity that is the attendant on divine truth; but they could not prevail upon the professors, in the different universities, to sacrifice the jargon of the schools to the dictates of common sense, nor to return to the plain, serious, and unaffected method of teaching theology that had been introduced by LUTHER. These obstinate doctors pleaded necessity in behalf of their scholastic divinity, and looked upon this pretended necessity as superior to all authorities, and all examples, however respectable.

XVIII. Those, who are sensible of the intimate connexion that there is between faith and practice, between the truths and duties of religion, will easily perceive the necessity that there was of reforming the corrupt morality, as well as the superstitious doctrines of the church of *Rome*. It was therefore natural, that the same persons, who had spirit enough to do the one, should think themselves obliged to attempt the other. This they accordingly attempted, and not without a certain degree of success; for it may be affirmed, with truth, that there is more genuine piety and more excellent rules of conduct in the few practical productions of LUTHER, MELANCTHON, WELLER, RIVIVS, to mention no more, than are to be found in the innumerable volumes of all the ancient *Casuits*, and *Moralisers* [c], as they are called in the barbarous language of these remote periods. It is not, however, meant even to insinuate, that the notions of these great men concerning the important science of morality were either sufficiently accurate or extensive. It appears, on the contrary, from the various debates that were carried on during this century, concerning the duties and obligations of Christians, and from the answers, that were given by famous casuists to persons perplexed with religious scruples, that the true *principles* of morality were not as yet fixed with perspicuity and precision, the agreement or difference between the laws of nature and the precepts of Christianity sufficiently examined and determined, nor the proper distinctions made between those parts of the gospel-dispensation, which are agreeable to right reason, and those that are beyond its reach and comprehension. Had not the number of adversaries, with whom the Lutheran doctors were obliged to contend, given them perpetual employment in the field of controversy,

The state of
morality among
the Lutherans.

[(c) The moral writers of this century were called *Moralisantes*, a barbarous term, of which the English word *Moralisers* bears some resemblance.]

CENT. XVI. and robbed them of that precious leisure which they might have consecrated to the advancement of real piety and virtue, they would certainly have been free from the defects, now mentioned; and would, perhaps, have equalled the best moral writers of modern times. This consideration will also diminish our wonder at a circumstance, which otherwise might seem surprising, that none of the famous Lutheran doctors attempted to give a regular system of morality. MELANCTHON himself, whose exquisite judgment rendered him peculiarly capable of reducing into a compendious system the elements of every science, never seems to have thought of treating morals in this manner; but has inserted, on the contrary, all his practical rules and instructions under the theological articles that relate to the *law, sin, free-will, faith, hope, and charity*.

Polemic or controversial theology.

XIX. All the divines of this century were educated in the school of controversy, and so trained up to spiritual war, that an eminent theologian and a bold and vehement disputant were considered as synonymous terms. It could scarcely, indeed, be otherwise in an age when foreign quarrels and intestine divisions of a religious nature threw all the countries of *Europe* into a state of agitation, and obliged the doctors of the contending churches to be perpetually in action, or at least in a posture of defence. These champions of the reformation were not, however, all animated with the same spirit, nor did they attack and defend with the same arms. Such of them as were contemporary with LUTHER, or lived near his time, were remarkable for the simplicity of their reasoning, and attacked their adversaries with no other arguments, than those which they drew from the declarations of the inspired writers, and the decisions of the ancient fathers. Towards the latter end of the century this method was considerably changed, and we see those doctors, who were its chief ornaments, reinforcing their cause with the succours of the Aristotelian philosophy, and thus losing, in point of perspicuity and evidence, what they gained in point of subtilty and imagined science. It is true, as has been already observed more than once, that they were too naturally, though inconsiderately, led to adopt this method of disputing by the example of their adversaries the Roman-catholics. The latter, having learnt, by a disagreeable and discouraging experience, that their cause was unable to support that plain and perspicuous method of reasoning, that is the proper test of religious and moral truth, had recourse to stratagem, when evidence failed, and involved both their arguments and their opinions in the dark and intricate mazes of the scholastic philosophy; and it was this that engaged the protestant doctors to change their weapons, and to employ methods of defence unworthy of the glorious cause in which they had embarked.

The spirit of zeal that animated the Lutheran divines was, generally speaking, very far from being tempered by a spirit of charity. If we except MELANCTHON, in whom a predominant mildness and sweetness of natural temper triumphed over the contagious ferocity of the times, all the disputants of this century discovered too much bitterness and animosity in their transactions and in their writings. LUTHER himself appears at the head

head of this sanguine tribe, whom he far surpassed in invectives and abuse, treating his adversaries with the most brutal asperity, and sparing neither rank nor condition, however elevated or respectable they might be. It must indeed be confessed, that the criminal nature of this asperity and vehemence will be much alleviated, when they are considered in one point of view with the genius of these barbarous times, and the odious cruelty and injustice of the virulent enemies, whom the oppressed reformers were called to encounter. When the impartial inquirer considers the abominable calumnies that were lavished on the authors and instruments of the reformation; when he reflects upon the horrors of fire and sword employed, by blood-thirsty and bigotted tyrants, to extirpate and destroy those good men whom they wanted arguments to persuade and convince; will not his heart burn with a generous indignation? and will he not think it, in some measure just, that such horrid proceedings should be represented in their proper colours, and be stigmatized by such expressions, as are suited to their demerit?

XX. In order to form a just idea of the internal state of the Lutheran church, and of the revolutions and changes that have happened in it, with their true springs and real causes, it is necessary to consider the history of that church under three distinct periods. The *first* of these extends from the commencement of the reformation to the death of LUTHER, which happened in the year 1546. The *second* takes in the space of time elapsed between the death of LUTHER and that of MELANCTHON, and consequently terminates in the year 1560; while the remainder of the century is comprehended in the *third* period.

Three periods must be distinguished in the history of the Lutheran church.

The FIRST PERIOD.

DURING the *First* period, all things were transacted in the Lutheran church in a manner conformable to the sentiments, counsels, and orders of LUTHER. This eminent reformer, whose undaunted resolution, and amazing credit and authority, rendered him equal to the most arduous attempts, easily suppressed the commotions and dissensions that arose from time to time in the church, and did not suffer the sects, that several had attempted to form in its bosom, to gather strength, or to arrive at any considerable degree of consistence and maturity. The natural consequence of this was, that, during the life of that great man, the internal state of the Lutheran church was a state of tolerable tranquillity and repose; and all such as attempted to foment divisions, or introduce any essential changes, were either speedily reduced to silence or obliged to retire from the new community.

XXI. The infancy of this church was troubled by an impetuous rabble of wrong-headed Fanatics, who introduced the utmost confusion wherever they had occasion to spread their pestilential errors, and who pretended, that they had received a divine inspiration, authorising them to erect a new kingdom of CHRIST, in which sin and corruption were to have no place. The leaders of this turbulent and riotous sect were MUNZER, STORCHIUS,

Debates between Luther and the Fanatics that troubled the church during this first period.

CENT. XVI. STUBNER, and others, partly Swiss, and partly Germans, who kindled the flame of discord and rebellion in several parts of *Europe*, and chiefly in *Germany*, and excited among the ignorant multitude tumults and commotions, which, though less violent in some places than in others, were, nevertheless, formidable wherever they appeared [d]. The history of this seditious band is full of obscurity, and confusion. A regular, full, and accurate account of it neither has, nor could well be, committed to writing; since, on the one hand, the opinions and actions of these Fanatics were a motley chaos of inconsistencies and contradictions, and, on the other, the age, in which they lived, produced few writers who had either the leisure or the capacity to observe with diligence, or to relate with accuracy, commotions and tumults of this extraordinary kind. It is however certain, that, from the most profligate and abandoned part of this enthusiastical multitude, those seditious armies were formed, which kindled in *Germany* the *War of the Peasants*, and afterwards, seizing upon the city of *Munster*, involved the whole province of *Westphalia* in the most dreadful calamities. It is also well known, that the better part of this motley tribe, terrified by the unhappy and deserved fate of their unworthy associates, whom they saw extirpated and massacred with the most unrelenting severity, saved themselves from the ruin of their sect, and, at length, embraced the communion of those, who are called *Mennonites* [e]. The zeal, vigilance, and resolution of LUTHER happily prevented the divisions, which the odious disciples of MUNZER attempted to excite in the church he had founded, and preserved the giddy and credulous multitude from their seductions. And it may be safely affirmed, that, had it not been for the vigour and fortitude of this active and undaunted reformer, the Lutheran church would, in its infancy, have fallen a miserable prey to the enthusiastic fury of these detestable fanatics [f].

Carlostadt.

XXII. Fanatics and enthusiasts of the kind now described, while they met with the warmest opposition from LUTHER, found, on the contrary, in CARLOSTADT, his colleague, such a credulous attention to their seductions as naturally flattered them with the hopes of his patronage and favour. This divine, who was a native of *Franconia*, was neither destitute of learning nor merit; but imprudence and precipitation were the distinguishing lines of his warm and violent character. Of these he gave the most evident marks, in the year 1522, when, during the absence of LUTHER, he excited no small tumult at *Wittenberg*, by ordering the images to be taken out of

[d] JO. BAPTISTA OTTIUS, in his *Annales Anabaptistæ*, p. 8. has collected a considerable number of facts relating to these fanatical commotions, which are also mentioned by all the writers of the History of the Reformation.

[(e) The tumults of the anabaptists in *Germany*, and the junction of the better part of them, with MENNON, have already been mentioned in a cursory manner, Sect. I. chap. ii. § xxi. For an ample account of the origin, doctrine, and progress of the Mennonites, see the third chapter of the second part of the third section. Cent. xvi.]

[(f) The danger, that threatened the Lutheran church in these tumults of the German anabaptists, was so much the greater on account of the inclination, which MUNZER and STORCK discovered, at first, for the sentiments of LUTHER, and the favourable disposition, which CARLOSTADT seemed, for some time, to entertain with respect to these fanatics.]

the churches, and other enterprizes of a rash and dangerous nature [g]. CEN. XVI. This tumult was appeased by the sudden return of LUTHER, whose presence and exhortations calmed the troubled spirits of the people; and here must we look for the origin of the rupture between him and CAROLOSTADT. For the latter immediately retired from *Wittemberg* to *Orlamund*, where he not only opposed the sentiments of LUTHER concerning the Eucharist [h], but also discovered, in several instances, a fanatical turn of mind [i]. He was, therefore, commanded to leave the electorate of *Saxony*, which he did accordingly, and repaired to *Switzerland*, where he propagated his doctrines, and taught with success, first at *Zurich* and afterwards at *Basil*, retaining still, however, as long as he lived, a favourable disposition to the sect of the anabaptists, and, in general, to all enthusiastic teachers, who pretended to a divine inspiration [k]. Thus then did LUTHER, in a short space of time, lay this new storm that the precipitation of CAROLOSTADT had raised in the church.

[g] The reader may perhaps imagine from Dr. MOSHEIM's account of this matter, that CAROLOSTADT introduced these changes merely by his own authority; but this was far from being the case; the suppression of private masses, the removal of images out of the churches, the abolition of the law which imposed celibacy upon the clergy, which are the changes hinted at by our historian as *rash* and *perilous*, were effected by CAROLOSTADT in conjunction with BUGENHAGIUS, MELANCTHON, JONAS, AMSDORFF, and others, and were confirmed by the authority of the elector of *Saxony*. So that there is some reason to apprehend that one of the principal causes of LUTHER's displeasure at these changes, was their being introduced in his absence; unless we suppose that he had not so far got rid of the fetters of superstition, as to be sensible of the absurdity and of the pernicious consequences of the use of images, &c. As to the abolition of the law that imposed celibacy on the clergy, it is well known, that it was the object of his warmest approbation. This appears from the following expressions in his letter to AMSDORFF: *CAROLOSTADII nuptiæ mire placent: novi puellam: confortet eum Dominus in bonum exemplum inbibendæ et minuendæ Papiſticæ libidinis.* He confirmed soon afterwards this approbation by his own example.]

[h] This difference of opinion between CAROLOSTADT and LUTHER concerning the eucharist, was the true cause of the violent rupture between these two eminent men, and it was very little to the honour of the latter. For however the explication, which the former gave of the words of the institution of the Lord's supper, may appear forced, yet the sentiments he entertained of that ordinance as a commemoration of CHRIST's death, and not as a celebration of his bodily presence, in consequence of a *consubstantiation* with the bread and wine, are infinitely more rational than the doctrine of LUTHER, which is loaded with some of the most palpable absurdities of *transubstantiation*. And if it is supposed that CAROLOSTADT strained the rule of interpretation too far, when he alledged, that CHRIST pronounced the pronoun *this* (in the words, *This is my body*) pointing to his *body*, and not to the *bread*, what shall we think of LUTHER's explaining the non-sensical doctrine of *consubstantiation* by the similitude of a red-hot iron, in which two elements are united, as the body of CHRIST is with the bread in the eucharist? But of this more in its proper place.]

[i] This censure is with too much truth applicable to CAROLOSTADT. — Though he did not adopt the impious and abominable doctrines of MUNZER and his band (as Dr. MOSHEIM permits the uninstructed reader to imagine by mentioning, *in general*, his being a friend to these fanatics) yet he certainly was chargeable with some extravagancies, that were observable in the tenets of that wrong-headed tribe. He was for abolishing the *civil law*, with the municipal laws and constitutions of the German empire, and proposed substituting the law of MOSES in their place. He distinguished himself by railing at the academies, declaiming against human learning, and other follies.

Great wits to madness nearly are allied.

See VAL. ERN. LOSCHERI *Historia motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformat.* part. I. cap. i. — DAN. GERDES, *Vita Carolostadii*, in *Miscell. Groningens.* novis, tom. i.]

[k] This affirmation of Dr. MOSHEIM wants much to be modified. In the original it stands. XXIII. The

CENT. XVI.

Schwenckfeldt.

XXIII. The reforming spirit of CARLOSTADT, with respect to the doctrine of CHRIST's presence in the eucharist, was not extinguished, by his exile, in the Lutheran church. It was revived, on the contrary, by a man of much the same turn of mind, a Silesian knight, and counsellor to the duke of Lignitz, whose name was GASPAR SCHWENCKFELDT. This nobleman, seconded by VALENTINE CRAUTWALD, a man of eminent learning, who lived at the court of the prince now mentioned, took notice of many things which he looked upon as erroneous and defective in the opinions and rites established by LUTHER; and, had not the latter been extremely vigilant as well as vigorously supported by his friends and adherents, would have undoubtedly brought about a considerable schism in the church. Every circumstance in SCHWENCKFELDT's conduct and appearance was adapted to give him credit and influence. His morals were pure, and his life, in all respects, exemplary. His exhortations in favour of true and solid piety were warm and persuasive, and his principal zeal was employed in promoting it among the people. By these means he gained the esteem and friendship of many learned and pious men both in the Lutheran and Helvetic churches, who favoured his sentiments, and undertook to defend him against all his adversaries [1]. Notwithstanding all this, he was banished by his sovereign both from the court and from his country in the year 1528, only because ZUINGLE had approved of his opinions concerning the eucharist, and declared that they did not differ essentially from his own. From that time the persecuted knight wandered from place to place, under various turns of fortune, until death put an end to his trials in the year 1561 [m]. He had founded a small congregation in *Silesia*, which were persecuted and ejected in our times by the popish possessors of that country;

thus, *Dum vixit vero anabaptistarum, et hominum divina visa jactantium partibus amicum sese ostendit, i. e. as long as he lived, he shewed himself a friend to the anabaptists and other enthusiasts, who pretended to divine inspiration.* But how could our historian assert this without restriction, since it is well known that CARLOSTADT, after his banishment from *Saxony*, composed a treatise against enthusiasm, in general, and against the extravagant tenets and the violent proceedings of the anabaptists in particular. Nay more; this treatise was addressed to LUTHER, who was so affected by it, that, repenting of the unworthy treatment he had given to CARLOSTADT, he pleaded his cause, and obtained from the elector a permission for him to return into *Saxony*. See GERDES, *Vita Carolostadii*, in *Miscell. Groningens.* After his reconciliation with LUTHER, he composed a treatise, on the eucharist, which breathes the most amiable spirit of moderation and humility; and, having perused the writings of ZUINGLE, where he saw his own sentiments on that subject maintained with the greatest perspicuity and force of evidence, he repaired, a second time, to *Zurich*, and from thence to *Basil*, where he was admitted to the offices of pastor and professor of divinity, and where, after having lived in the exemplary and constant practice of every Christian virtue, he died amidst the warmest effusions of piety and resignation on the 25th of December, 1541. All this is testified solemnly in a letter of the learned and pious GRYNÆUS of *Basil* to PITISCUS, chaplain to the elector Palatine, and shews how little dependance is due to the assertions of the ignorant MORERI, or to the insinuations of the insidious BOSSUET.]

[1] See JO. CONR. FUESLINI *Centuria I Epistolar. à Reformatorebus Helveticis Scriptar.* 169. 175. 225. *Museum Helvetic.* tom. iv. p. 445.

[m] JO. WIGANDI *Schwenckfeldianismus*, Lips. 1586, in 4^{to}.—CONR. SCHLUSSELBURGI *Catalogi Hæreticor.* lib. x. published at *Frankfort* in the year 1599, in 8^{vo}.—The most accurate accounts of this nobleman have been given by CHR. AUG. SALIG. in his *Histor. August. Confessionis*, tom. iii. lib. xi. p. 951. and by GODF. ARNOLD, in a German work, entitled, *Kirchen- und Ketzer Historie*, p. 720. both which authors have pleaded the cause of SCHWENCKFELDT.

but

but have been restored to their former habitations and privileges, civil and religious, since the year 1742, by the present king of *Prussia* [n].

CENT. XVI.

XXIV. The upright intentions of SCHWENCKFELDT, and his zeal for the advancement of true piety, deserve, no doubt, the highest commendation; but the same thing cannot be said of his prudence and judgment. The good man had a natural propensity towards fanaticism, and fondly imagined that he had received a divine commission to propagate his opinions. He differed from LUTHER and the other friends of the reformation in three points, which it is proper to select from others of less consequence: The *first* of these points related to the doctrine concerning the eucharist. SCHWENCKFELDT inverted the following words of CHRIST: *This is my body*, and insisted on their being thus understood: "*My body is THIS, i. e. such*" "as this bread, which is broken and consumed: a true and real food" "which nourisheth, satisfieth, and delighteth the soul. *My blood is THIS,*" "that is, such in its effects as the wine which strengthens and refresheth the" "heart." The poor man imagined that this *wonderful* doctrine had been revealed to him from heaven, which circumstance alone is a sufficient demonstration of his folly.

The doctrine of
Schwenckfeldt.

The *second* point, in which he differed from LUTHER, was in his hypothesis, relating to the efficacy of the divine word. He denied, for example, that the *external word*, which is committed to writing in the Holy Scriptures, was endowed with the power of *healing, illuminating, and renewing* the mind; and he ascribed this power to the *internal word*, which, according to his notion, was CHRIST himself. His discourses, however, concerning this *internal word*, were, as usually happens to persons of his turn, so full of confusion, obscurity, and contradiction, that it was difficult to find out, what his doctrine really was, and whether or no it resembled that of the Mysticks and Quakers, or was borrowed from a different source.

His doctrine concerning the *human nature* of CHRIST formed the *third* subject of debate between him and the Lutherans. He would not allow CHRIST's human nature, in its exalted state, to be called a *creature*, or a created substance, as such denominations appeared to him infinitely below its majestic dignity, united as it is, in that glorious state, with the divine essence. This notion of SCHWENCKFELDT bears a remarkable affinity to the doctrine of EUTYCHES, which, however, he professed to reject; and, in his turn, accused those of Nestorianism, who gave the denomination of a *creature* to the human nature of CHRIST.

XXV. An intemperate zeal, by straining too far certain truths, turns them into falsehood, or, at least, often renders them the occasion of the most pernicious abuses. A striking instance of this happened during the ministry of LUTHER. For, while he was insisting upon the necessity of imprinting deeply in the minds of the people that doctrine of the gospel, which represents CHRIST's merits as the source of man's salvation, and while he was eagerly employed in censuring and refuting the popish doctors, who

The Antinomians.

[n] See an account of SCHWENCKFELDT'S *Confession of Faith*, in JO. CHR. KOCHER'S *Bibliotheca Theologica Symbolica*, p. 457.

CENT. XVI. mixed the *law* and the *gospel* together, and represented eternal happiness as the fruit of legal obedience, a fanatic arose, who abused his doctrine by over-straining it, and thus opened a field for the most dangerous errors. This new teacher was JOHN AGRICOLA, a native of *Aisleben*, and an eminent doctor of the Lutheran church, though chargeable with vanity, presumption, and artifice. He first began to make a noise in the year 1538, when, from the doctrine of LUTHER now mentioned, he took occasion to declaim against the *law*, maintaining that it was neither fit to be proposed to the people as a rule of manners, nor to be used in the church as a mean of instruction; and that the *gospel* alone was to be inculcated and explained both in the churches and in the schools of learning. The followers of AGRICOLA were called *Antinomians*, i. e. *enemies of the law*. But the fortitude, vigilance, and credit of LUTHER suppressed this sect in its very infancy; and AGRICOLA, intimidated by the opposition of such a respectable adversary, acknowledged and renounced his pernicious system. But this recantation does not seem to have been sincere; since it is said, that, when his fears were dispelled by the death of LUTHER, he returned to his errors, and gained proselytes to his extravagant doctrine [o].

The doctrine of
Agricola examin-
ed.

XXVI. The tenets of the *Antinomians*, if their adversaries are to be believed, were of the most noxious nature and tendency; for they are supposed to have taught the loosest and most dissolute doctrine in point of morals, and to have maintained, that it was allowable to follow the impulse of every passion and to transgress, without reluctance, the divine law, provided the transgressor *laid hold on CHRIST*, and embraced his merits by a lively faith. Such, at least, is the representation that is, generally, given of their doctrine; but it ought not to be received with too much credulity. For whoever looks into this matter, with attention and impartiality, will soon be persuaded, that such an absurd and impious doctrine is unjustly laid to the charge of AGRICOLA, and that the principal fault of this presumptuous man lay in some harsh and inaccurate expressions, that were susceptible of dangerous and pernicious interpretations. By the term *law* he understood the *Ten Commandments*, promulgated under the Mosaic dispensation; and he considered this law as enacted for the Jews, and not for Christians. He explained, at the same time, the term *Gospel* (which he considered as substituted in the place of the law) in its true and extensive sense, as comprehending, not only the doctrine of the merits of CHRIST, rendered salutary by faith, but also the sublime precepts of holiness and virtue delivered by the divine Saviour, as rules of obedience. If, therefore, we follow the intention of AGRICOLA, without interpreting, in a rigorous manner, the uncouth phrases and improper expressions he so frequently and so injudiciously employed, his doctrine will plainly amount to this: "That the *Ten Commandments* published, during the ministry of MOSES, were chiefly designed for the Jews, and on that account might be lawfully neg-

[o] See CASPAR. SAGITTARIUS *Introduc. ad Histor. Ecclesiast.* tom. i. p. 838.—BAYLE *Dictionnaire*, tom. ii. at the article ISLEBIUS.—CONR. SCHLUSSELBURGH *Catalog. Hæret.* lib. iv. —G. ARNOD. *Kirchen und Ketzer Historie*, p. 813.

“lected and laid aside by Christians: and that it was sufficient to explain CENT. XVI.
 “with perspicuity, and to enforce with zeal, what CHRIST and his apostles
 “had taught in the New Testament, both with respect to the means of
 “grace and salvation, and the obligations of repentance and virtue.” The
 greatest part of the doctors of this century are chargeable with a want of
 precision and consistency in expressing their sentiments; hence their real
 sentiments have been misunderstood, and opinions have been imputed to
 them which they never entertained.

The SECOND PERIOD.

XXVII. AFTER the death of LUTHER, which happened in the year 1546, PHILIP MELANCTHON was placed at the head of the Lutheran doctors. The merit, genius, and talents of this new chief were, undoubtedly, great and illustrious; though it must, at the same time, be confessed, that he was inferior to LUTHER in many respects [p], and more especially in courage, steadfastness, and personal authority. His natural temper was soft and flexible; his love of peace, almost excessive; and his apprehensions of the displeasure and resentment of men in power were such as betrayed a pusillanimous spirit. He was ambitious of the esteem and friendship of all, with whom he had any intercourse, and was absolutely incapable of employing the force of threatnings, or the restraints of fear, to suppress the efforts of religious faction, to keep within due bounds the irregular love of novelty and change, and to secure to the church the obedience of its members. It is also to be observed, that MELANCTHON's sentiments, on some points of no inconsiderable moment, were entirely different from those of LUTHER; and it may not be improper to point out the principal subjects on which they adopted different ways of thinking.

Debates that
arose during the
second period of
the Lutheran
church, between
the death of
Luther and that
of Melancthon.

In the *first* place, MELANCTHON was of opinion, that, for the sake of peace and concord, many things might be connived at and tolerated in the church of *Rome*, which LUTHER considered as absolutely unsupportable. The former carried so far the spirit of toleration and indulgence, as to discover no reluctance against retaining the ancient form of ecclesiastical government; and submitting to the dominion of the Roman pontif, on certain conditions, and in such a manner, as might be without prejudice to the obligation and authority of all those truths, that are clearly revealed in the Holy Scriptures.

A *second* occasion of a diversity of sentiments between these two great men was furnished by the tenets which LUTHER maintained in opposition to the doctrines of the church of *Rome*. Such were his ideas concerning faith, as the *only* cause of salvation, concerning the necessity of good works

[(p) It would certainly be very difficult to point out the *many respects* in which Dr. MOSHEIM affirms that LUTHER was superior to MELANCTHON. For if the single article of courage and firmness of mind be excepted, I know no other respect in which MELANCTHON is not superior, or, at least, equal to LUTHER. He was certainly his equal in piety and virtue, and much his superior in learning, judgment, meekness, and humanity.]

CENT. XVI. to our final happiness, and man's natural incapacity of promoting his own conversion. In avoiding the corrupt notions which were embraced by the Roman-catholic doctors on these important points of theology, LUTHER seemed, in the judgment of MELANCTHON, to lean too much towards the opposite extreme [q]. Hence the latter inclined to think, that the sentiments and expressions of his colleague required to be somewhat mitigated, lest they should give a handle to dangerous abuses, and be perverted to the propagation of pernicious errors.

It may be observed, *thirdly*, that though MELANCTHON adopted the sentiments of LUTHER in relation to the eucharist [r], yet he did not consider their controversy with the divines of *Switzerland* on that subject, as a matter of sufficient moment to occasion a breach of church-communion, and fraternal concord between the contending parties. He thought that this happy concord might be easily preserved by expressing the doctrine of the eucharist and CHRIST's presence in that ordinance, in general and ambiguous terms, which the two churches might explain according to their respective systems.

Such were the sentiments of MELANCTHON, which, though he did not entirely conceal, during the life of LUTHER, he delivered, nevertheless, with great circumspection and modesty, yielding always to the authority of his colleague, for whom he had a sincere friendship, and of whom also he stood in awe. But no sooner were the eyes of LUTHER closed, than he inculcated with the greatest plainness and freedom, what he had before only hinted at with timorousness and caution. The eminent rank MELANCTHON held among the Lutheran doctors rendered this bold manner of proceeding extremely disagreeable to many. His doctrine accordingly was censured and opposed; and thus the church was deprived of the tranquillity it had enjoyed under LUTHER, and exhibited an unhappy scene of animosity, contention, and discord.

[(p) It is certain, that LUTHER carried the doctrine of *Justification by Faith* to such an excessive length, as seemed, though perhaps contrary to his intention, to derogate not only from the necessity of good works, but even from their obligation and importance. He would not allow them to be considered either as the *conditions* or *means* of salvation, nor even as a preparation for receiving it.]

[(r) It is somewhat surprizing to hear Dr. MOSHEIM affirming that MELANCTHON adopted the sentiments of LUTHER in relation to the eucharist, when the contrary is well known. It is true, in the writings of MELANCTHON, which were published before the year 1529, or 1530, there are passages, which shew that he had not, as yet, thoroughly examined the controversy relating the nature of CHRIST's presence in the eucharist. It is also true, that during the disputes carried on between WESTPHAL and CALVIN, after the death of LUTHER, concerning the *real presence*, he did not declare himself in an open manner for either side (which, however, is a presumptive proof of his leaning to that of CALVIN) but expressed his sorrow at these divisions, and the spirit of animosity, by which they were inflamed. But, whoever will be at the pains to read the letters of MELANCTHON to CALVIN upon this subject, or those extracts of them, that are collected by HOSPINIAN, in the second volume of his *Historia Sacramentaria*, p. 428. will be persuaded, that he looked upon the doctrine of *Consubstantiation* not only as erroneous, but even as idolatrous; and that nothing but the fear of inflaming the present divisions, and of not being seconded, prevented him from declaring his sentiments openly. See also *Dictionnaire de BAYLE*, art. MELANCTHON, note L.]

XXVIII. The rise of these unhappy divisions must be dated from the year 1548, when CHARLES V attempted to impose upon the Germans the famous edict, called the *Interim*. MAURICE, the new elector of Saxony, desirous to know how far such an edict ought to be respected in his dominions, assembled the doctors of *Wittenberg* and *Leipfic* in the last mentioned city, and proposed this nice and critical subject to their serious examination. Upon this occasion MELANCTHON, complying with the suggestions of that lenity and moderation, that were the great and leading principles in the whole course of his conduct and actions, declared it as his opinion, that, in matters of an indifferent nature, compliance was due to the imperial edicts [s]. But in the class of matters indifferent, this great man and his associates placed many things which had appeared of the highest importance to LUTHER, and could not, of consequence, be considered as indifferent by his true disciples [t]. For he regarded as such, the doctrine of justification by faith alone; the necessity of good works to eternal salvation; the number of the sacraments; the jurisdiction claimed by the pope and the bishops; extreme unction; the observation of certain religious festivals and several superstitious rites and ceremonies. Hence arose that violent scene of contention and discord, that was commonly called the *Adiaphoristic* [u] controversy, which divided the church during many years, and proved highly detrimental to the progress of the reformation. The defenders of the primitive doctrines of Lutheranism, with FLACIUS at their head, attacked with incredible bitterness and fury the doctors of *Wittenberg* and *Leipfic*, and particularly MELANCTHON, by whose counsel and influence every thing relating to the *Interim* had been conducted, and accused them of apostacy from the true religion. MELANCTHON, on the other hand, seconded by the zeal of his friends and disciples, justified his conduct with the utmost spirit and vigour [w]. In this unlucky debate the two following questions were principally discussed: First, whether the matters that seemed indifferent to MELANCTHON were so in reality? This his adversaries obstinately denied [x]. Secondly, whether, in things of an indifferent nature, and in which the interests

The adiaphoristic controversy, of the dispute concerning matters of an indifferent nature, to which

[s] The piece, in which MELANCTHON and his associates delivered their sentiments relating to things indifferent, is commonly called, in the German language, *Das Leipziger Interim*, and was republished at *Leipfic* in 1721, by BIERUS, in a work, entitled, *Das dreysache Interim*.

[t] If they only are the true disciples of LUTHER, who submit to his judgment and adopt his sentiments in theological matters, many doctors of that communion, and our historian among the rest, will certainly be supposed to have forfeited that title, as will abundantly appear hereafter. Be that as it may, MELANCTHON can scarcely, if, at all, be justified in placing in the class of things indifferent, the doctrines relating to faith and good works, which are the fundamental points of the Christian religion, and, if I may use such an expression, the very hinges on which the gospel turns.

[u] This controversy was called *Adiaphoristic*; and MELANCTHON and his followers *Adiaphorists*, from the Greek word *ἀδιάφορος*, which signifies indifferent.

[w] SCHLUSSENBURGI *Catalog. Hereticor.* lib. xiii.—ARNOLD's German work, entitled, *Kirchen- und Keiser Historie*, lib. xvi. cap. xxvi. p. 816.—SALIC. *Histor. Aug. Confess.* vol. i. p. 611.—The German work, entitled, *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, A. 1702, p. 339, 393.—LUC. OSIANDRI *Epitome Histor. Eccles. Centur.* xvi. p. 502.

[x] See above note [w].

CENT. XVI. of religion are not essentially concerned, it be lawful to yield to the enemies of the truth?

A controversy is set on foot by George Major, concerning the necessity of good works.

XXIX. This debate concerning things *indifferent* became, as might well have been expected, a fruitful source of other controversies which were equally detrimental to the tranquillity of the church, and to the cause of the reformation. The first to which it gave rise, was the warm dispute concerning the *necessity of good works*, that was carried on with such spirit against the rigid Lutherans by GEORGE MAJOR, an eminent teacher of theology at *Wittenberg*. MELANCTHON had long been of opinion, that the *necessity of good works in order to the attainment of everlasting salvation* might be asserted and taught as conformable to the truths revealed in the gospel; and both he and his colleagues declared this to be their opinion, when they were assembled at *Leipsic*, in the year 1548, to examine the famous edict already mentioned [y]. This declaration was severely censured by the rigid disciples of LUTHER, as contrary to the doctrine and sentiments of their chief, and as conformable both to the tenets and interests of the church of *Rome*; but it found an able defender in MAJOR, who, in the year 1552, maintained the *necessity of good works* against the extravagant assertions of AMSDORF. Hence arose a new controversy between the rigid and moderate Lutherans, which was carried on with that keenness and animosity, that were peculiar to all debates of a religious nature during this century. In the course of this warm debate, AMSDORF was so far transported and infatuated by his excessive zeal for the doctrine of LUTHER, as to maintain, that *good works were an impediment to salvation*; by which imprudent expression the flame of controversy received new fuel, and broke forth with redoubled fury. On the other hand, MAJOR complained of the malice or ignorance of his adversaries, who explained his doctrine in a manner quite different from that in which he intended it should be understood; and, at length, he renounced it entirely, that he might not appear fond of wrangling, or be looked upon as a disturber of the peace of the church. This step did not, however, put an end to the debate, which was still carried on, until it was terminated at last by the *Form of concord* [z].

The synergistical controversy.

XXX. From the same source that produced the dispute concerning the necessity of good works arose the *synergistical* controversy. The *Synergists* [a], whose doctrine was almost the same with that of the Semi-pelagians, denied that God was the *only* agent in the conversion of sinful man; and affirmed, that man *co-operated* with divine grace in the accomplishment of this salutary purpose. Here also MELANCTHON renounced the doctrine of LUTHER; at least, the terms he employs in expressing his sentiments concerning this intricate subject, are such as LUTHER would have rejected.

[y] The *Interim*, of CHARLES V.

[z] SCHLUSSENBERG, lib. vii. *Catal. Hereticor.* — ARNOLDI *Hist. Ecclesiae*, lib. xvi. cap. xxvii. p. 822. — Jo. MUSEI *Praelection. in Form. Concord.* p. 181. — ARN. GREVI *Memoria Joh. WESTPHALI*, p. 166.

[a] As this controversy turned upon the *co-operation* of the human will with the divine grace, the persons, who maintained this joint-agency, were called *Synergists*, from a Greek word (*συνεργεῖν*), which signifies *co-operation*.]

with horror; for in the conference at *Leipsic*, already mentioned, the former of these great men did not scruple to affirm, that God drew to himself and converted adult persons in such a manner, that the powerful impression of his grace was accompanied with a certain correspondent action of their will. The friends and disciples of MELANCTHON adopted this manner of speaking, and used the expressions of their master to describe the nature of the divine agency in man's conversion. But this representation of the matter was far from being agreeable to the rigid Lutherans. They looked upon it as subversive of the true and genuine doctrine of LUTHER, relating to the absolute servitude of the human will [b], and the total inability of man to do any good action, or to bear any part in his own conversion; and hence they opposed the Synergists, or Semi-pelagians with the utmost animosity and bitterness. The principal champions in this theological conflict were STRIGELIUS, who defended the sentiments of MELANCTHON with singular dexterity and perspicuity, and FLACIUS, who maintained the ancient doctrine of LUTHER: of these doctors, as also of the subject of their debate, a farther account will be given presently [c].

XXXI. During these dissensions a new academy was founded at *Jena* by the dukes of *Saxe-Weimar*, the sons of the famous JOHN FREDERICK, whose unsuccessful wars with the emperor CHARLES V had involved him in so many calamities, and deprived him of his electoral dominions. The noble founders of this academy, having designed it for the bulwark of the protestant religion, as it was taught and inculcated by LUTHER, were particularly careful in choosing such professors and divines as were remarkable for their attachment to the genuine doctrine of that great reformer, and their aversion to the sentiments of those moderate Lutherans, who had attempted, by certain modifications and corrections, to render it less harsh and disgusting. And as none of the Lutheran doctors were so eminent, on account of their brutal and intemperate zeal for this ancient doctrine, as MATTHEW FLACIUS, the virulent enemy of MELANCTHON, and all the *Philippists*, he was appointed, in the year 1557, professor of divinity at *Jena*. The consequences of this nomination were, indeed, deplorable. For this turbulent and impetuous man, whose nature had formed with an uncommon propensity to foment divisions and propagate discord, did not only revive all the ancient controversies that had distracted the church, but also excited new debates; and sowed, with such avidity and success, the seeds of contention between the divines of *Weimar* and those of the electorate of *Saxony*, that a fatal schism in the Lutheran church was apprehended by many of its wisest

Flacius, by his intemperate zeal, excites many divisions in the church.

[b] The doctrines of absolute predestination, irresistible grace, and human impotence, were never carried to a more excessive length, nor maintained with a more virulent obstinacy by any divine, than they were by LUTHER. But in these times he has very few followers in this respect, even among those that bear his name. But of this more hereafter.]

[c] See SCHLUSSENBERG Catalog. *Hæreticor.* lib. v.—G. ARNOLD. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. xvi. cap. xxviii. p. 826.—BAYLE *Dictionaire*, at the article SYNERGISTES.—SALIG. *Hist. August. Confess.* vol. iii. p. 474, 587, 880.—MUSEI *Praelect. in Formulam Concordiae*, p. 88.

members.

CENT. XVI.

members [d]. And, indeed, this Schism would have been inevitable, if the machinations and intrigues of FLACIUS had produced the desired effect. For in the year 1559, he persuaded the dukes of *Saxe-Weimar* to order a *refutation* of the errors that had crept into the Lutheran church, and particularly of those that were imputed to the followers of MELANCTHON, to be drawn up with care, to be promulgated by authority, and to be placed among the other religious edicts and articles of faith, that were in force in their dominions. But this pernicious design of dividing the church proved abortive; for the other Lutheran princes, who acted from the true and genuine principles of the reformation, disapproved of this seditious book, from a just apprehension of its tendency to increase the present troubles, and to augment, instead of diminishing, the calamities of the church [e].

The contest between Flacius and Strigelius.

XXXII. This theological incendiary kindled the flame of discord and persecution even in the church of *Saxe-Weimar*, and in the university of *Jena* to which he belonged, by venting his fury against STRIGELIUS [f], the friend and disciple of MELANCTHON. This moderate divine adopted, in many things, the sentiments of his master, and maintained, particularly, in his public lectures, that the *human will*, when under the influence of the *divine grace* leading it to repentance, was not totally *inactive*, but bore a certain part in the salutary work of its conversion. In consequence of this doctrine he was accused, by FLACIUS, of *Synergism* at the court of *Saxe-Weimar*, and by the order of the prince was cast into prison, where he was treated with severity and rigour. He was, at length, delivered from this confinement in the year 1562, and allowed to resume his former vocation, in consequence of a declaration of his real sentiments, which, as he alleged, had been greatly misrepresented. This declaration, however, did not either decide or terminate the controversy; since STRIGELIUS seemed rather to conceal his erroneous sentiments [g] under ambiguous expressions, than to renounce them entirely. And indeed, he was so conscious of this, himself, that, to avoid being involved in new calamities and persecutions, he retired from *Jena* to *Leipsic*, and from *Leipsic* to *Heidelberg*, where he spent the remainder of his days; and appeared so unsettled in his religious opinions, that it is really doubtful whether he is to be placed among the followers of LUTHER or CALVIN.

Some particulars of the dispute carried on by Flacius at *Saxe-Weimar*.

XXXIII. The issue, however, of this controversy, which FLACIUS had kindled with such an intemperate zeal, proved highly detrimental to his own reputation and influence in particular, as well as to the interests of the Lutheran church in general. For while this vehement disputant was

[d] See the famous letter of AUGUSTUS, elector of *Saxony*, concerning FLACIUS and his malignant attempts, which is published by ARN. GREVIUS, in his *Memoria Joh. Westphali*, P. 393.

[e] SALIG, *Historia August. Confess.* vol. iii. p. 476.

[f] See the writers cited in the preceding notes; and also BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article STRIGELIUS.

[[g] The sentiments of STRIGELIUS were not, I have reason to believe, very *erroneous* in the judgment of Dr. MOSHEIM, nor are they such in the estimation of the greatest part of the Lutheran doctors at this day.]

affailing his adversary with an inconsiderate ardor, he exaggerated so excessively the sentiments, which he looked upon as orthodox, as to maintain an opinion of the most monstrous and detestable kind; an opinion which made him appear, even in the judgment of his warmest friends, an odious heretic, and a corruptor of the true religion. In the year 1560, a public dispute was held at *Weimar*, between him and STRIGELIUS, concerning the natural powers and faculties of the human mind, and their influence in the conversion and conduct of the true Christian. In this conference the latter seemed to attribute to unassisted nature, too much, and the former, too little. The one looked upon the fall of man, as an event that extinguished, in the human mind, every virtuous tendency, every noble faculty, and left nothing behind it but universal darkness and corruption. The other maintained, that this degradation of the powers of nature was, by no means, universal or entire; that the will retained still some propensity to worthy pursuits, and a certain degree of activity that rendered it capable of attainments in virtue. STRIGELIUS, who was well acquainted with the wiles of a captious philosophy; proposed to defeat his adversary by puzzling him, and addressed to him, with that view, the following question: *Whether original sin, or the corrupt habit which the human soul contracted by the fall, is to be placed in the class of SUBSTANCES or ACCIDENTS?* FLACIUS answered with unparalleled imprudence and temerity, that it belonged to the former; and maintained, to his dying hour, this most extravagant and dangerous proposition, that *original sin is the very substance of human nature*. Nay, so invincible was the obstinacy with which he persevered in this strange doctrine, that he chose to renounce all worldly honours and advantages rather than depart from it. It was condemned by the greatest and soundest part of the Lutheran church, as a doctrine that bore no small affinity to that of the Manicheans. But, on the other hand, the merit, erudition, and credit of FLACIUS procured him many respectable patrons and able defenders among the most learned doctors of the church, who embraced his sentiments, and maintained his cause with the greatest spirit and zeal, of whom the most eminent were CYRIAC SPANGENBERG, CHRISTOPHER IRENÆUS, and CÆLESTINE [b].

XXXIV. It is scarcely possible to imagine how much the Lutheran church suffered from this new dispute in all those places where its contagion had reached, and how detrimental it was to the progress of Lutheranism among those who still adhered to the religion of *Rome*. For the flame of discord spread far and wide; it was communicated even to those churches which were erected in popish countries, and particularly in the Austrian territories, under the gloomy shade of a dubious toleration; and it so animated the Lutheran pastors, though surrounded on all sides by their cruel

The consequences that arose from the imprudence of Flacius.

[b] SCHLUSSENBERG. *Catalog. Hæreticor.* lib. ii.—*The Life of FLACIUS*, written in German by RITTER, and published in 8^{vo} at *Frankfort*, in the year 1725.—SALIG, *Histor. Aug. Confession.* vol. iii. p. 593.—ARNOLDI *Histor. Ecclesiast.* lib. xvi. cap. xxix. p. 829.—MUSÆI *Prælect. in Formul. Concordiæ*, p. 29.—JO. GEORGI LEUCKFELDI *Historia Spangenbergensis*.—For a particular account of the dispute, that was held publicly at *Weimar*, see the German work, entitled, *Unschuld. Nachricht.* p. 383.

CENT. XVI. adversaries, that they could neither be restrained by the dictates of prudence nor by the sense of danger [i]. Many are of opinion, that an ignorance of philosophical distinctions and definitions threw FLACIUS inconsiderately into the extravagant hypothesis he maintained with such obstinacy, and that his greatest heresy was no more than a foolish attachment to an unusual term. But FLACIUS seems to have fully refuted this plea in his behalf, by declaring boldly, in several parts of his writings, that he knew perfectly well the philosophical signification and the whole energy of the word *substance*, and was, by no means, ignorant of the consequences that would be drawn from the doctrine he had embraced [k]. Be that as it may, we cannot but wonder at the senseless and excessive obstinacy of this turbulent man, who chose rather to sacrifice his fortune and disturb the tranquillity of the church, than to abandon a word, which was entirely foreign to the subject in debate, and renounce an hypothesis, that was composed of the most palpable contradictions.

The disputes
kindled by Osi-
ander.

XXXV. The last controversy that we shall mention, of those that were occasioned by the excessive lenity of MELANCTHON, was set on foot by OSIANDER, in the year 1549, and produced much discord and animosity in the church. Had its first founder been yet alive, his influence and authority would have suppressed in their birth these wretched disputes; nor would OSIANDER, who despised the moderation of MELANCTHON, have dared either to publish or defend his crude and chimerical opinions within the reach of LUTHER. Arrogance and singularity were the principal lines in OSIANDER's character; he loved to strike out new notions; but his views seemed always involved in an intricate obscurity. The disputes, that arose concerning the *Interim*, induced him to retire from Nuremberg, where he had exercised the pastoral charge to Konigsberg, where he was chosen professor of divinity. In this new station he began his academical functions by propagating notions concerning the *Divine Image*, and the nature of *Repentance*, very different from the doctrine that LUTHER had taught on these interesting subjects; and, not contented with this deviation from the common track, he thought proper, in the year 1550, to introduce considerable alterations and corrections into the doctrine that had been generally received in the Lutheran church with respect to the means of our *justification* before God. When we examine his discussion of this important point, we shall find it much more easy to perceive the opinions he rejected, than to understand the system he had invented or adopted; for, as was but too usual in this age, he not only expressed his notions in an obscure manner, but seemed moreover perpetually in contradiction with himself. His

[i] See a German work of BERN. RAUPACH, entitled, *Zweifache Zugabe zu dem Evangelisch. Oesterrich*, p. 25. 29. 32. 34. 43. 64. The same author speaks of the friends of FLACIUS in *Austria*; and particularly of IRENÆUS, in his *Presbyterol. Austriacæ*, p. 69.—For an account of CÆLESTINE, see the German work mentioned at the end of the preceding note.

[k] This will appear evident to such as will be at the pains to consult the letters which WESTPHAL wrote to his friend FLACIUS, in order to persuade him to abstain from the use of the word *substance*, with the answers of the latter. These *Letters* and *Answers* are published by ARNOLD GREVIUS, in his *Memoria Jo. Westphali*, p. 186.

doctrine however, when carefully examined, will appear to amount to the following propositions: "CHRIST, considered in his *human nature only*, could not, by his obedience to the divine law, obtain *justification*, and pardon for sinners; neither can we be *justified* before God by embracing and applying to ourselves through faith the *righteousness* and obedience of the *man* CHRIST. It is only through that eternal and *essential righteousness*, which dwells in CHRIST *considered as God*, and which resides in his divine nature, that is united to the human, that mankind can obtain complete *justification*. Man becomes a partaker of this *divine righteousness* by faith; since it is in consequence of this uniting principle that CHRIST dwells in the heart of man, with his divine righteousness; now wherever this divine righteousness dwells, there God can behold no sin, and therefore, when it is present with CHRIST in the hearts of the *regenerate*, they are, on its account, considered by the Deity as *righteous*, although they be sinners. Moreover, this *divine and justifying righteousness* of CHRIST excites the faithful to the pursuit of holiness and to the practice of virtue." This doctrine was zealously opposed by the most eminent doctors of the Lutheran church, and, in a more especial manner, by MELANCTHON and his colleagues. On the other hand, OSIANDER and his sentiments were supported by persons of considerable weight. But, upon the death of this rigid and fanciful divine, the flame of controversy was cooled, and dwindled by degrees into nothing [1].

XXXVI. The doctrine of OSIANDER concerning the method of being justified before God, appeared so absurd to STANCARUS, professor of Hebrew at *Königsberg*, that he undertook to refute it. But while this turbulent and impetuous doctor was exerting all the vehemence of his zeal against the opinion of his colleague, he was hurried, by his violence, into the opposite extreme, and fell into an hypothesis, that appeared equally groundless, and not less dangerous in its tendency and consequences. OSIANDER had maintained, that the man CHRIST, in his character of moral agent, was obliged to obey, for *himself*, the divine law, and therefore could not by the imputation of this obedience obtain *righteousness* or justification for *others*. From hence he concluded, that the Saviour of the world had been empowered, not by his character as *man*, but by his nature as *God*, to make expiation for our sins, and reconcile us to the favour of an offended Deity. STANCARUS, on the other hand, excluded entirely CHRIST's divine nature from all concern in the *satisfaction* he made, and in the *redemption* he procured for offending mortals; and maintained, that the sacred office of a mediator between God and man belonged to JESUS, considered in his human

The debates excited by Stancarus.

[1] See SCHLUSSELBURGII *Catalogus Hæreticor.* lib. vi.—ARNOLDI *Histor. Eccles.* lib. xvi. cap. xxiv. p. 804.—CHRIST. HARTKNOCH *Preussische Kirchen-Historie*, p. 309.—SALIG, *Historia August. Confession.* tom. ii. p. 922. The judgment that was formed of this controversy, by the divines of *Wittenberg*, may be seen in the German work, entitled, *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, p. 141. and that of the doctors of *Copenhagen*, in *der Dänischen Bibliothec.* part. vii. p. 150. where there is an ample list of the writings published on this subject.—To form a just idea of the insolence and arrogance of OSIANDER, those who understand the German language will do well to consult HIRSCHIIUS, *Nuremberg. Interims-Historie*, p. 44. 59, 60, &c.

CENT. XVI. nature alone. Having perceived, however, that this doctrine exposed him to the enmity of many divines, and even rendered him the object of popular resentment and indignation, he retired from *Königsberg* into *Germany*, and from thence into *Poland*, where he excited no small commotions [m], and where also he concluded his days in the year 1574 [n].

The methods
that were em-
ployed to heal
these divisions.

XXXVII. All those, who had the cause of virtue and the advancement of the reformation really at heart, looked with an impatient ardor for an end to these bitter and uncharitable contentions; and their desires of peace and concord in the church were still increased by their perceiving the industrious assiduity with which *Rome* turned these unhappy divisions to the advancement of her interests. But during the life of MELANCTHON, who was principally concerned in these warm debates, no effectual method could be found to bring them to a conclusion. The death of this great man, which happened in the year 1560, changed, indeed, the face of things, and enabled those, who were disposed to terminate the present contests, to act with more resolution and a surer prospect of success, than had accompanied their former efforts. Hence it was, that, after several vain attempts, AUGUSTUS elector of *Saxony*, and JOHN WILLIAM, duke of *Saxe-Weimar*, summoned the most eminent doctors of both the contending parties to meet at *Altenburg* in the year 1568, and there to propose in an amicable manner and with a charitable spirit their respective opinions, that thus it might be seen how far a reconciliation was possible, and what was the most probable method of bringing it about. But the intemperate zeal and warmth of the disputants, with other unlucky circumstances, blasted the fruits that were expected from this conference [o]. Another method of restoring tranquillity and union among the members of the Lutheran church was therefore proposed; and this was, that a certain number of wise and moderate divines should be employed in composing a *Form* of doctrine in which all the controversies, that divided the church, should be terminated and decided; and that this new compilation, as soon as it was approved of by the Lutheran princes and consistories, should be clothed with ecclesiastical authority, and added to the *symbolical* [p] or standard-books of the Lu-

[m] See a German work of CHR. HARTKNOCH, entitled, *Preussische Kirchengeschichte*, p. 340.—SCHLUSSELBURGII *Catalog. Hæreticor.* lib. ix.—*Dictionnaire du BAYLE*, at the article STANCARUS.—Before the arrival of STANCARUS at *Königsberg*, in the year 1548, he had lived for some time in *Switzerland*, where also he had occasioned religious disputes; for he adopted several doctrines of LUTHER, particularly that concerning the virtue and efficacy of the sacraments, which were rejected by the Swiss and Grisons. See the *Museum Helveticum*, tom. v. p. 484. 490, 491. For an account of the disturbances he occasioned in *Poland* in 1556, see BULLINGER, in JO. CORR. FUESLINI *Centuria I. Epistolar. à Reformatore. Helvetic. scriptar.* p. 371. 459.

[n] The main argument alledged by STANCARUS, in favour of his hypothesis, was this, that if CHRIST was mediator by his divine nature only, then it followed evidently, that even considered as God, he was inferior to the father; and thus, according to him, the doctrine of his adversary OSIANDER led directly to the Unitarian system. This difficulty, which was presented with great subtilty, engaged many to strike into a middle road, and to maintain that both the divine and human natures of CHRIST were immediately concerned in the work of Redemption.]

[o] CASP. SAGITTARI *Introductio ad Hist. Ecclesiasticam*, part. II. p. 1542.

[p] The Lutherans call *symbolical* (from a Greek word that signifies collection or compilation) the books, which contain their articles of faith and rules of discipline.]

theran church. JAMES ANDREÆ, professor at *Tubingen*, whose theological abilities had procured him the most eminent and shining reputation; had been employed so early as the year 1569, in this critical and difficult undertaking, by the special command of the dukes of *Wurtemberg* and *Brunswick*. The elector of *Saxony* [q], with several persons of distinction, embarked with these two princes in the project they had formed; so that ANDREÆ, under the shade of such a powerful protection and patronage, exerted all his zeal, travelled through different parts of *Germany*, negotiated alternately with courts and synods, and took all the measures, which prudence could suggest, in order to render the *Form*, that he was composing, universally acceptable.

XXXVIII. The persons, embarked in this new and critical design, were persuaded that no time ought to be lost in bringing it into execution, when they perceived the imprudence and temerity of the disciples of MELANCTHON, and the changes they were attempting to introduce into the doctrine of the church. For his son-in-law PEUCER [r], who was a physician and professor of natural philosophy at *Wittemberg*, together with the divines of *Wittemberg* and *Leipsick*, encouraged by the approbation and relying on the credit of CRACOVIVUS chancellor of *Dresden*, and of several ecclesiastics and persons of distinction at the Saxon court, aimed at nothing less than abolishing the doctrine of LUTHER concerning the eucharist and the person of CHRIST, with a design to substitute the sentiments of CALVIN in its place. This new reformation was attempted in *Saxony* in the year 1570, and a great variety of clandestine arts and stratagems were employed in order to bring it to a happy and successful issue. What the sentiments of MELANCTHON concerning the eucharist were, towards the conclusion of his days, appears to be extremely doubtful. It is however, certain, that he had a strong inclination to form a coalition between the Saxons and Calvinists, though he was prevented, by the irresolution and timidity of his natural character, from attempting openly this much desired union. PEUCER, and the other disciples of MELANCTHON already mentioned, made a public profession of the doctrine of CALVIN; and though they had much more spirit and courage than their soft and yielding master, yet they wanted his circumspection and prudence, which were not less necessary to the accomplishment of their designs. Accordingly, in the year 1571, they published

The Saxon
Crypto-Calvi-
nists, or, secret
favourers of Cal-
vinism.

[q] AUGUSTUS.

[(r)] This PEUCER, whom Dr. MOSHELM mentions without any mark of distinction, was one of the wisest, most amiable and most learned men that adorned the annals of German literature during this century, as the well known history of his life, and the considerable number of his medical, mathematical, moral, and theological writings, abundantly testify. Nor was he more remarkable for his merit, than for his sufferings. After his genius and virtues had rendered him the favourite of the elector of *Saxony*, and placed him at the head of the university of *Wittemberg*, he felt, in a terrible manner, the effects of the bigotry and barbarity of the rigid Lutherans, who, on account of his denying the corporal presence of CHRIST in the eucharist, united, with success, their efforts to deprive him of the favour of his sovereign, and procured his imprisonment. His confinement, which lasted ten years, was accompanied with all possible circumstances of severity. See MELCHIOR ADAM, *Vit. Medicor. Germanor.*

CENT. XVI. nature alone. Having perceived, however, that this doctrine exposed him to the enmity of many divines, and even rendered him the object of popular resentment and indignation, he retired from *Königsberg* into *Germany*, and from thence into *Poland*, where he excited no small commotions [m], and where also he concluded his days in the year 1574 [n].

The methods
that were em-
ployed to heal
these divisions.

XXXVII. All those, who had the cause of virtue and the advancement of the reformation really at heart, looked with an impatient ardor for an end to these bitter and uncharitable contentions; and their desires of peace and concord in the church were still increased by their perceiving the industrious assiduity with which *Rome* turned these unhappy divisions to the advancement of her interests. But during the life of MELANCTHON, who was principally concerned in these warm debates, no effectual method could be found to bring them to a conclusion. The death of this great man, which happened in the year 1560, changed, indeed, the face of things, and enabled those, who were disposed to terminate the present contests, to act with more resolution and a surer prospect of success, than had accompanied their former efforts. Hence it was, that, after several vain attempts, AUGUSTUS elector of *Saxony*, and JOHN WILLIAM, duke of *Saxe-Weimar*, summoned the most eminent doctors of both the contending parties to meet at *Altenburg* in the year 1568, and there to propose in an amicable manner and with a charitable spirit their respective opinions, that thus it might be seen how far a reconciliation was possible, and what was the most probable method of bringing it about. But the intemperate zeal and warmth of the disputants, with other unlucky circumstances, blasted the fruits that were expected from this conference [o]. Another method of restoring tranquillity and union among the members of the Lutheran church was therefore proposed; and this was, that a certain number of wise and moderate divines should be employed in composing a *Form* of doctrine in which all the controversies, that divided the church, should be terminated and decided; and that this new compilation, as soon as it was approved of by the Lutheran princes and consistories, should be clothed with ecclesiastical authority, and added to the *symbolical* [p] or standard-books of the Lu-

[m] See a German work of CHR. HARTKNOCH, entitled, *Preussische Kirken-geschichte*, p. 340.—SCHLÜSSELBURGHII *Catalog. Hæreticor.* lib. ix.—*Dictionnaire du BAYLE*, at the article STANCARUS.—Before the arrival of STANCARUS at *Königsberg*, in the year 1548, he had lived for some time in *Switzerland*, where also he had occasioned religious disputes; for he adopted several doctrines of LUTHER, particularly that concerning the virtue and efficacy of the sacraments, which were rejected by the Swiss and Grisons. See the *Museum Helveticum*, tom. v. p. 484. 490, 491. For an account of the disturbances he occasioned in *Poland* in 1556, see BULLINGER, in JO. CONR. FUESLINI *Centuria I. Epistolar. à Reformatore. Helvetic. scriptar.* p. 371. 459.

[(n)] The main argument alledged by STANCARUS, in favour of his hypothesis, was this, that if CHRIST was mediator by his divine nature only, then it followed evidently, that even considered as God, he was inferior to the father; and thus, according to him, the doctrine of his adversary OSIANDER led directly to the Unitarian system. This difficulty, which was presented with great subtilty, engaged many to strike into a middle road, and to maintain that both the divine and human natures of CHRIST were immediately concerned in the work of Redemption.]

[o] CASP. SAGITTARIJ *Introductio ad Hist. Ecclesiasticam*, part. II. p. 1542.

[(p)] The Lutherans call *symbolical* (from a Greek word that signifies collection or compilation) the books, which contain their articles of faith and rules of discipline.]

theran church. JAMES ANDREÆ, professor at *Tubingen*, whose theological abilities had procured him the most eminent and shining reputation; had been employed so early as the year 1569, in this critical and difficult undertaking, by the special command of the dukes of *Wurtemberg* and *Brunswick*. The elector of *Saxony* [q], with several persons of distinction, embarked with these two princes in the project they had formed; so that ANDREÆ, under the shade of such a powerful protection and patronage, exerted all his zeal, travelled through different parts of *Germany*, negotiated alternately with courts and synods, and took all the measures, which prudence could suggest, in order to render the *Form*, that he was composing, universally acceptable.

XXXVIII. The persons, embarked in this new and critical design, were persuaded that no time ought to be lost in bringing it into execution, when they perceived the imprudence and temerity of the disciples of MELANCTHON, and the changes they were attempting to introduce into the doctrine of the church. For his son-in-law PEUCER [r], who was a physician and professor of natural philosophy at *Wittemberg*, together with the divines of *Wittemberg* and *Leipsick*, encouraged by the approbation and relying on the credit of CRACOVIVUS chancellor of *Dresden*, and of several ecclesiastics and persons of distinction at the Saxon court, aimed at nothing less than abolishing the doctrine of LUTHER concerning the eucharist and the person of CHRIST, with a design to substitute the sentiments of CALVIN in its place. This new reformation was attempted in *Saxony* in the year 1570, and a great variety of clandestine arts and stratagems were employed in order to bring it to a happy and successful issue. What the sentiments of MELANCTHON concerning the eucharist were, towards the conclusion of his days, appears to be extremely doubtful. It is however, certain, that he had a strong inclination to form a coalition between the Saxons and Calvinists, though he was prevented, by the irresolution and timidity of his natural character, from attempting openly this much desired union. PEUCER, and the other disciples of MELANCTHON already mentioned, made a public profession of the doctrine of CALVIN; and though they had much more spirit and courage than their soft and yielding master, yet they wanted his circumspection and prudence, which were not less necessary to the accomplishment of their designs. Accordingly, in the year 1571, they published

The Saxon
Crypto-Calvi-
nists, or, secret
favourers of Cal-
vinism.

[q] AUGUSTUS.

[(r) This PEUCER, whom Dr. MOSHEIM mentions without any mark of distinction, was one of the wisest, most amiable and most learned men that adorned the annals of German literature during this century, as the well known history of his life, and the considerable number of his medical, mathematical, moral, and theological writings, abundantly testify. Nor was he more remarkable for his merit, than for his sufferings. After his genius and virtues had rendered him the favourite of the elector of *Saxony*, and placed him at the head of the university of *Wittemberg*, he felt, in a terrible manner, the effects of the bigotry and barbarity of the rigid Lutherans, who, on account of his denying the corporal presence of CHRIST in the eucharist, united, with success, their efforts to deprive him of the favour of his sovereign, and procured his imprisonment. His confinement, which lasted ten years, was accompanied with all possible circumstances of severity. See MELCHIOR ADAM, *Vit. Medicor. Germanor.*]

CENT. XVI. in the German language a work, entitled *Stereoma* [s], and other writings, in which they openly declared their dissent from the doctrine of LUTHER concerning the *Eucharist* and the *Person of CHRIST* [t]; and, that they might execute their purposes with greater facility, introduced into the schools a Catechism, compiled by PEZELIUS, which was favourable to the sentiments of CALVIN. As this bold step excited great commotions and debates in the church, AUGUSTUS held at *Dresden*, in the year 1571, a solemn convocation of the Saxon divines, and of all other persons concerned in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs, and commanded them to adopt his opinion in relation to the eucharist [u]. The assembled doctors complied with this order in appearance; but their compliance was feigned [w]; for, on their return to the places of their abode, they resumed their original design, pursued it with assiduity and zeal, and by their writings, as also by their public and private instructions, endeavoured to abolish the ancient doctrine of the Saxons relating to the presence of CHRIST's body in that holy sacrament. The elector, informed of these proceedings, convened anew the Saxon doctors, and held, in the year 1574, the famous convocation of *Torgau* [x], where, after a strict inquiry into the doctrines of those,

[s] A term which signifies *foundation*.]

[t] The learned historian seems to deviate here from his usual accuracy. The authors of the book, entitled, *Stereoma*, did not declare their dissent from the doctrine of LUTHER, but from the extravagant inventions of some of his successors. This great man, in his controversy with ZUINGLE, had, indeed, thrown out some unguarded expressions, that seemed to imply a belief of the *omnipresence* of the body of CHRIST; but he became sensible, afterwards, that this opinion was attended with great difficulties, and particularly that it ought not to be made use of as a *proof* of CHRIST's *corporal presence* in the eucharist*. But this absurd hypothesis was renewed, (after the death of LUTHER, by TINMAN and WESTPHAL, and was dressed up, in a still more specious and plausible form, by BRENTIUS, CHERNITZ, and ANDREÆ, who maintained, *the communication of the properties of CHRIST's divinity to his human nature*, in the manner that it was afterwards adopted by the Lutheran church. This strange system gave occasion to the book, entitled, *Stereoma*, in which the doctrine of LUTHER was respected, and the inventions alone of his successors renounced, and in which the authors declared plainly, that they did not adopt the sentiments of ZUINGLE or CALVIN; nay, that they admitted the real and substantial presence of CHRIST's body and blood in the eucharist.]

[u] In this passage, compared with what follows, Dr. MOSHEIM seems to maintain, that the opinion of AUGUSTUS, which he imposed upon the assembled divines, was in favour of the adversaries of MELANCTHON, and in direct opposition to the authors of the *Stereoma*. But here, he has committed a palpable oversight. The convocation of *Dresden*, in the year 1571, instead of approving or maintaining the doctrine of the rigid Lutherans, drew up, on the contrary, a *form of agreement* (*formula consensus*) in which the *omnipresence* or *ubiquity* of CHRIST's body was denied, and which was, indeed, an abridgment of the book, entitled, *Stereoma*. So that the transactions at *Dresden* were entirely favourable to the moderate Lutherans, who embraced openly and sincerely (and not by a *feigned* consent (*subdole*) as our historian remarks) the sentiment of the elector AUGUSTUS, who, at that time, patronized the disciples of MELANCTHON. This prince, it is true, seduced by the crafty and artful insinuations of the *Ubiquitarians*, or rigid Lutherans, who made him believe that the ancient doctrines of the church were in danger, changed sides soon after, and was pushed on to the most violent and persecuting measures, of which the convocation of *Torgau* was the first step, and the *Form of Concord* the unhappy issue.]

[w] The compliance was sincere; but the order was very different from that mentioned by our author; as appears from the preceding note.]

[x] It is to be observed, that there were but *fifteen* of the Saxon doctors convened at *Torgau*

* See LUTHERI Opp. tom. viii. p. 375. Edit. Jen.

who from their secret attachment to the sentiments of the Swiss divines were called *Crypto-Calvinists* [y], he committed some of them to prison, sent others into banishment, and engaged a certain number by the force of the secular arm to change their sentiments. PEUCER, who had been principally concerned in moderating the rigour of some of LUTHER's doctrines, felt, in a more especial manner, the dreadful effects of the elector's severity. For he was confined to a hard prison, where he lay in the most affecting circumstances of distress until the year 1585, when, having obtained his liberty, through the intercession of the prince of *Anhalt*, who had given his daughter in marriage to AUGUSTUS, he retired to *Zerbst*, where he ended his days in peace [z].

CENT. XVI.

The Form of.
Concord.

XXXIX. The schemes of the *Crypto-Calvinists*, or secret abettors of Calvinism, being thus disconcerted, the elector of *Saxony* and the other princes, who had entered into his views, redoubled their zeal and diligence in promoting the *Form of Concord* that has been already mentioned. Accordingly, various conferences were held, preparatory to this important undertaking; and, in the year 1576, while the Saxon divines were convened at *Torgaw* by the order of AUGUSTUS, a treatise was composed by JAMES ANDREÆ, with a design to heal the divisions of the Lutheran church, and as a preservative against the opinions of the *Reformed* doctors [a]. This production, which received the denomination of the *Book of Torgaw*, from the place where it was composed, having been carefully examined, reviewed, and corrected by the greatest part of the Lutheran doctors in *Germany*, the matter was again proposed to the deliberations of a select number of divines who met at *Berg*, a Benedictine monastery in the neighbourhood of *Magdeburg* [b]. Here all things relating to the intended project were accurately weighed, the opinions of the assembled doctors carefully discussed, and the result of all was the famous *Form of Concord*, which has made so much noise in the world. The persons who assisted ANDREÆ in the composition of this celebrated work, or at least in the last perusal of it at *Berg*, were MARTIN

by the summons of the elector; a small number this, to give law to the Lutheran church. For an account of the declaration drawn up by this assembly, on the points relating to the presence of CHRIST's body in the eucharist, the omnipresence of that body, and the oral manducation of the flesh and blood of the divine Saviour; see HOSPINIANI *Concordia Discors*, p. 39.]

[(y) i. e. Hidden or disguised Calvinist.]

[z] See SCHLUSSELBURGI *Theologia Calvinistica*, lib. ii. p. 207. lib. iii. *Præf.* & p. 1—22. 52—57. 69. lib. iv. p. 246.—HUTTERI *Concordia Concors*, cap. i—viii.—ARNOLDI *Histor. Ecclesiast.* lib. xvi. cap. xxxii. p. 389—395.—LOSCHERI *Historia motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformat.* part. II. p. 176. part. III. p. 1.—All these are writers favourable to the rigid Lutherans; see therefore, on the other side, CASP. PEUCERI *Historia Carcerum et Liberationis Divina*, which was published in 8^{vo} at *Zurich*, in the year 1605, by PEZELIUS.

[(a) The term *Reformed* was used to distinguish the other Protestants of various denominations from the Lutherans; and it is equally applied to the friends of episcopacy and presbytery. See the following chapter.]

[(b) The book that was composed by ANDREÆ and his associates at *Torgaw*, was sent, by the elector of *Saxony*, to almost all the Lutheran princes, with a view to its being examined, approved, and received by them. It was, however, rejected by several princes, and censured and refuted by several doctors. These censures engaged the compilers to review and correct it; and it was from this book, thus changed and new modelled, that the *Form of Concord*, published at *Berg*, was entirely drawn.]

CENT. XVI. CHEMNITZ, NICHOLAS SELNECCER, ANDREW MUSCULUS, CHRISTOPHER CORNERUS, and DAVID CHYTRÆUS [c]. This new confession of the Lutheran faith was adopted first by the Saxons, in consequence of the strict order of AUGUSTUS; and their example was afterwards followed by the greatest part of the Lutheran churches, by some sooner, by others later [d]. The authority of this confession, as is sufficiently known, was employed for the two following purposes, *first*, to terminate the controversies, which divided the Lutheran church, more especially after the death of its founder; and *secondly*, to preserve that church against the opinions of the *Reformed* in relation to the eucharist.

The Form of Concord produces much disturbance,—

is opposed by the Reformed, or Calvinists,

XL. It so fell out however, that this very *Form*, which was designed to restore peace and concord in the church, and had actually produced this effect in several places, became nevertheless a source of new tumults, and furnished matter for the most violent dissensions and contests. It immediately met with a warm opposition from the *Reformed*, and also from all those, who were either secretly attached to their doctrine, or who, at least, were desirous of living in concord and communion with them from a laudable zeal for the common interests of the protestant cause. Nor was their opposition at all unaccountable, since they plainly perceived, that this *Form* removed all the flattering hopes, they had entertained, of seeing the divisions that reigned among the friends of religious liberty happily healed, and entirely excluded the *Reformed* from the communion of the Lutheran church. Hence they were filled with indignation against the authors of this new *Confession of faith*, and exposed their uncharitable proceedings in writings full of spirit and vehemence. The Swiss doctors, with HOSPINIAN at

[c] The *Form of Concord*, composed at Torgaw; and reviewed at Berg, consists of two Parts. In the *first* is contained a system of doctrine drawn up according to the fancy of the *six doctors* here mentioned. In the *second* is exhibited one of the strongest instances of that persecuting and tyrannical spirit, which the protestants complained of in the church of Rome, even a formal CONDEMNATION of all those who differed from these *six doctors*, particularly in their strange opinions concerning the *majesty* and *omnipresence* of CHRIST's body, and the *real manducation* of his flesh and blood in the eucharist. This *condemnation* branded with the denomination of hereticks, and excluded from the communion of the church, all Christians of all nations, who refused to subscribe these doctrines. More particularly, in Germany, the terrors of the sword were solicited against these pretended hereticks, as may be seen in the famous Testament of BRENTIUS. For a full account of the *Confession* of Torgaw and Berg, see HOSPINIAN's *Concordia Discors*; where the reader will find large extracts out of this confession, with an ample account of the censures it underwent, the opposition that was made to it, and the arguments that were used by its learned adversaries.]

[d] A list of the writers who have treated concerning the *Form of Concord*, may be found in JO. GEORG. WALCHII *Introduc. in Libros Symbolicos*, lib. i. cap. vii. p. 707. & KOECHERI *Biblioth. Theol. Symbolicæ*, p. 188. There are also several Documents in MSS relative to this famous confession, of which there is an account in the German work, entitled, *Unschuld. Nachricht*. A. 1753. p. 322.—The principal writers who have given the history of the *Form of Concord*, and the transactions relating to it, are HOSPINIAN, an eminent divine of Zurich, in his *Concordia Discors*; and LEON. HUTTER, in his *Concordia Concors*. These two historians have written on opposite sides; and whoever will be at the pains of comparing their accounts with attention and impartiality, will easily perceive where the truth lies, and receive satisfactory information with respect to the true state of these controversies, and the motives that animated the contending parties.

their

their head, the Belgic divines [e], those of the Palatinate [f], together with the principalities of *Anbalt* and *Bade*, declared war against the *Form of Concord*. And accordingly from this period the Lutheran, and more especially the Saxon doctors, were charged with the disagreeable task of defending this new Creed and its compilers in many laborious productions [g].

XLI. Nor were the followers of ZUINGLE and CALVIN the only opposers of this *Form of Concord*; it found adversaries, even in the very bosom of Lutheranism, and several of the most eminent churches of that communion rejected it with such firmness and resolution, that no arguments nor entreaties could engage them to admit it as a rule of faith, or even as a mean of instruction. It was rejected by the churches of *Hessia*, *Pomerania*, *Nuremberg*, *Holstein*, *Silesia*, *Denmark*, *Brunswick*, and others [h]. But though they all united in opposing it, their opposition was nevertheless founded on different reasons, nor did they all act in this affair from the same motives and the same principles. A warm and affectionate veneration for the memory of MELANCTHON was, with some, the only, or, at least, the predominant motive that induced them to declare against the *Form* in question; they could not behold, without the utmost abhorrence, a production in which the sentiments of this great and excellent man were so rudely treated. In this class we may rank the Lutherans of *Holstein*. Others were not only animated in their opposition by a regard for MELANCTHON, but also by a persuasion, that the opinions, condemned in the new Creed, were more conformable to truth, than those that were substituted in their place. A secret attachment to the sentiments of the Helvetic doctors prevented some from approving of the *Form* under consideration; the hopes of uniting the *Reformed* and *Lutheran* churches engaged many to declare against it; and a considerable number refused their assent to it from an apprehension,

and even by the
Lutherans them-
selves.

[e] See PETRI VILLERII *Epistola Apologetica Reformatarum in Belgio Ecclesiarum ad et contra Auctores Libri Bergensis dicti "Concordiæ."* This work was published a second time with the Annotations of LUD. GERHARD à RENESSE, by the learned Dr. GERDES of Groningen, in his *Scrinium Antiquarium, seu Miscellan. Groningens.* Nov. tom. i. p. 121. Add to these the *Unschuld. Nachricht.* A. 1747, p. 957.

[f] JOHN CASIMIR, Prince Palatine, convoked an assembly of the *Reformed Divines* at *Frankfort* in the year 1577, in order to annul and reject this *Form of Concord*. See HEN. ALTINGII *Histor. Eccles. Palatin.* § clxxix. p. 143.

[g] See JO. GEORG. WALCHII *Introd. in Libros Symbolicos Lutheranor.* lib. i. cap. vii. p. 734.

[h] For an account of the ill success the *Form of Concord* met with in the dutchy of *Holstein*, see the German work, entitled, *Die Dänische Bibliothec.* vol. iv. p. 212. vol. v. p. 355. vol. viii. p. 333—468. vol. ix. p. 1.—MUHLII *Dissert. Histor. Theol. Diss. I. de Reformat. Holsat.* p. 108.—ARN. GREVII *Memoria PAULI ab EITZEN.* The transactions in *Denmark* in relation to this *Form*, and the particular reasons for which it was rejected there, may be seen in the *Danish Library* above quoted, vol. iv. p. 222—282. and also in PONTOPPIDAN'S *Annal. Eccles. Danicæ Diplomatici*, tom. iii. p. 456. This latter author evidently proves (p. 476.) a fact, which HERMAN ab EESWICH, and other authors, have endeavoured to represent as dubious, viz. that FREDERICK II, king of *Denmark*, as soon as he received a copy of the *Form* in question, threw it into the fire, and saw it consumed before his eyes.—The opposition that was made by the Hessians to the same *Form*, may be seen in TIELEMANNI *Vitæ Theologor. Marpurgens.* p. 99.—*Danischen Bibliothec.* vol. vii. p. 273—364. tom. ix. p. 1—87.—The ill fate of this famous Confession, in the principalities of *Lignitz* and *Brieg*, is amply related in the German work, entitled, *Unschuld. Nachricht.* A. 1745, p. 173.

whether

CENT. XVI. whether real or pretended, that adding a new *Creed* to the ancient confessions of faith would be really a source of disturbance and discord in the Lutheran church. It would be endless to enumerate the different reasons alledged by the different individuals or communities, who declared their dissent from the *Form of Concord*.

The conduct of Julius, duke of Brunswick, in this matter.

XLII. This *Form* was patronised in a more especial manner by JULIUS, duke of *Brunswick*, to whom, in a great measure, it owed its existence, who had employed both his authority and munificence in order to encourage those who had undertaken to compose it, and had commanded all the ecclesiastics, within his dominions, to receive and subscribe it as a rule of faith. But scarcely was it published, when the zealous prince changed his mind, suffered the *Form* to be publicly opposed by HESHUSIUS, and other divines of his university of *Helmstadt*, and to be excluded from the number of the Creeds and confessions that were received by his subjects. The reasons alledged by the Lutherans of *Brunswick*, in behalf of this step, were, 1st, That the *Form of Concord*, when printed, differed in several places from the manuscript copy to which they had given their approbation: 2^{dly}, That the doctrine relating to the *freedom* of the *human will* was expressed in it without a sufficient degree of accuracy and precision, and was also inculcated in the harsh and improper terms that LUTHER had employed in treating that subject: 3^{dly}, That the *ubiquity* or universal and *indefinite presence* of CHRIST's human nature was therein positively maintained, notwithstanding that the Lutheran church had never adopted any such doctrine. Besides these reasons for rejecting the *Form of Concord*, which were publicly avowed, others perhaps of a secret nature contributed to the remarkable change, which was visible in the sentiments and proceedings of the duke of *Brunswick*. Various methods and negociations were employed to remove the dislike which this prince and the divines that lived in his territories had conceived against the Creed of *Berg*. Particularly, in the year 1583, a convocation of divines from *Saxony*, *Brandenberg*, *Brunswick*, and the Palatinate was held at *Quedlinburg* for this purpose. But JULIUS persisted stedfastly in his opposition, and proposed that the *Form of Concord* should be examined, and its authority discussed by a general assembly or synod of the Lutheran church[i].

The Crypto-Calvinists make new attempts to spread their doctrine.

XLIII. This *Form* was not only opposed from abroad, but had likewise adversaries in the very country which gave it birth. For even in *Saxony* many, who had been obliged to subscribe it, beheld it with aversion in consequence of their attachment to the doctrine of MELANCTHON. During the administration of AUGUSTUS, they were forced to suppress their sentiments, but as soon as he had paid the last tribute to nature, and was succeeded by CHRISTIAN I, the moderate Lutherans and the secret Calvinists

[i] See LEON. HUTTERI *Concordia Concors*, cap. xlv. p. 1051.—PHIL. JUL. RCHTMEYERI *Braunschweig. Kirchen Historie*, part. III. cap. viii. p. 483.—See also the authors mentioned by CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFIUS, in his *Acta et Scripta Ecclesie Wurtemberg*. p. 62. & *Histor. Litterar. Theologiae*, part. II. p. 423.—For an account of the Convocation of *Quedlinburg* and the *Acts*, that passed in that assembly, see the German work, entitled, *Danische Bibliothek*. part. VIII. p. 595.

resumed their courage. The new elector had been accustomed, from his tender years, to the moderate sentiments of MELANCTHON, and is also said to have discovered a propensity to the doctrine of the Helvetic church. Under his government, therefore, a fair opportunity was offered to the persons abovementioned, of declaring their sentiments and executing their designs. Nor was this opportunity neglected. The attempts to abolish the *Form of Concord*, that had in time past proved unsuccessful, seemed again to be renewed, and that with a design to open a door for the entrance of Calvinism into Saxony. The persons who had embarked in this design, were greatly encouraged by the protection they received from several noblemen of the first rank at the Saxon court, and, particularly, from CRELLIUS, the first minister of CHRISTIAN. Under the auspicious influence of such patrons it was natural to expect success; yet they conducted their affairs with circumspection and prudence. Certain laws were previously enacted in order to prepare the minds of the people for the intended revolution in the doctrine of the church; and some time after [k] the form of *exorcism* was omitted in the administration of baptism [l]. These measures were followed by others still more alarming to the rigid Lutherans, for not only a new German Catechism favourable to the purpose of the secret Calvinists was industriously distributed among the people, but also, a new edition of the Bible in the same language, enriched with the observations of HENRY SALMUTH, which were artfully accommodated to this purpose, was, in the year 1591, published at *Dresden*. The consequences of these vigorous measures were violent tumults and seditions among the people, which the magistrates endeavoured to suppress by punishing with severity such of the clergy as distinguished themselves by their opposition to the views of the court. But the whole plan of this religious revolution was, all of a sudden, overturned by the unexpected death of CHRISTIAN, which happened in the year 1591. Then the face of affairs changed again, and assumed its former aspect. The doctors, who had been principally concerned in the execution of this unsuccessful project, were committed to prison, or sent into banishment, after the death of the elector; and its chief encourager and patron CRELLIUS suffered death in the year 1601, as the fruit of his temerity [m].

XLIV. Towards the conclusion of this century a new controversy was imprudently set on foot at *Wittenberg*, by SAMUEL HUBER, a native of *Switzerland*, and professor of divinity in that university. The calvinistical

The dispute set on foot by Huber.

[k] In the year 1591.

[l] The custom of *exorcising*, or, casting out *evil spirits*, was used in the fourth century at the admission of *Catechumens*, and was afterwards absurdly applied in the baptism of infants. This application of it was retained by the greatest part of the Lutheran churches. It was indeed abolished by the elector CHRISTIAN I, but was restored after his death; and the opposition that had been made to it by CRELLIUS was the chief reason of his unhappy end. See JUSTI. H. BOEHMERI *Jus Ecclesiast. Protestant.* tom. iii. p. 843. Ed. *Secund. Hala* 1727.—As also a German work of MELCHIOR KRAFT, entitled, *Geschichte des Exorcismi*, p. 401.

[m] See the German work of GODF. ARNOLD, entitled, *Kirchen-und Ketzer Historie*, part. II. book XVI. cap. xxxii. p. 863. As also the authors mentioned by HERM. ASCAN. ENGELKEN, in his *Dissertat. de Nic. Crellio, ejusque Supplicio, Rostochii* 1724, edit.

CENT. XVI. doctrine of absolute predestination, and unconditional decrees was extremely offensive to this adventurous doctor, and even excited his warmest indignation. Accordingly, he affirmed and taught publicly that all mankind were elected from eternity by the supreme Being to everlasting salvation, and accused his colleagues, in particular, and the Lutheran divines in general of a propensity to the doctrine of CALVIN, on account of their asserting, that the divine election was confined to those, whose *faith, foreseen* by an omniscient God, rendered them the proper objects of his redeeming mercy. The opinion of HUBER, as is now acknowledged by many learned men, differed more in *words* than in *reality*, from the doctrine of the Lutheran church; for he did no more than explain in a new method, and with a different turn of phrase, what that church had always taught concerning the unlimited extent of the love of God, as embracing the whole human race, and excluding none by an *absolute* decree from everlasting salvation. However, as a disagreeable experience and repeated examples had abundantly shewn that new methods of explaining or proving even received doctrines were as much adapted to excite divisions and contests, as the introduction of new errors, HUBER was exhorted to adhere to the ancient method of proposing the doctrine of *Election*, and, instead of his own peculiar forms of expression, to make use of those that were received and authorized by the church. This compliance, nevertheless, he refused to submit to, alledging, that it was contrary to the dictates of his conscience; while his patrons and disciples in many places gave several indications of a turbulent and seditious zeal for his cause. These considerations engaged the magistrates of *Wittemberg* to depose him from his office, and to send him into banishment [n].

The judgment that ought to be formed concerning all these controversies.

XLV. The controversies, of which a succinct account has now been given and others of inferior moment, which it is needless to mention, were highly detrimental to the true interests of the Lutheran church, as is abundantly known by all, who are acquainted with the history of this century. It must also be acknowledged, that the manner of conducting and deciding these debates, the spirit of the disputants, and the proceedings of the judges, if we form our estimate of them by the sentiments that prevail among the wiser sort of men in modern times, must be considered as inconsistent with equity, moderation, and charity. It betrays, nevertheless, a want both of candour and justice to inveigh indiscriminately against the authors of these misfortunes, and to represent them as totally destitute of rational sentiments and virtuous principles. And it is yet more unjust to throw the whole blame upon the triumphant party, while the suffering side are all fondly represented as men of unblemished virtue, and worthy of a better fate. It ought not certainly to be a matter of surprize, that persons long accustomed to a state of darkness, and suddenly transported from thence into the blaze of day, did not, at first, behold the objects that were presented to their view with that distinctness and precision, that are natural to those, who have long enjoyed the light. And such, really, was the case of the first pro-

[n] For an account of the writers that appeared in this controversy, see CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFII *Introductio in Histor. Litter. Theologiae*, part. II. lib. iii. p. 431.

testant doctors, who were delivered from the gloom of papal superstition and tyranny. Besides, there was something gross and indelicate in the reigning spirit of this age, which made the people not only tolerate, but even applaud many things relating both to the conduct of life and the management of controversy, which the more polished manners of modern times cannot relish, and which, indeed, are by no means worthy of imitation. As to the particular motives or intentions that ruled each individual in this troubled scene of controversy, whether they acted from the suggestions of malice and resentment, or from an upright and sincere attachment to what they looked upon to be the truth, or how far these two springs of action were jointly concerned in their conduct, all this must be left to the decision of him alone, whose privilege it is to search the heart, and to discern its most hidden intentions and its most secret motives.

XLVI. The Lutheran church furnished, during this century, a long list of considerable doctors, who illustrated, in their writings, the various branches of theological science. After LUTHER and MELANCTHON, who stand foremost in this list, on account of their superior genius and erudition, we may select the following writers, as the most eminent, and as persons whose names are worthy to be preserved in the annals of literature: viz. WELLER, CHEMNITZ, BRENTIUS, FLACIUS, REGIUS, MAJOR, AMSDORF, SARCIERUS, MATHESIUS, WIGANDUS, LAMBERTUS, ANDREÆ, CHYTRÆUS, SELNECCER, BUCER, FAGIUS, CRUCIGER, STRIGELIUS, SPANGENBERG, JUDEX, HESHUSIUS, WESTPHAL, ÆPINUS, OSIANDER, and others [o].

The principal doctors and writers of this century.

CHAP. II.

The History of the REFORMED [p] Church.

I. **T**HE nature and constitution of the *Reformed Church*, which was formerly denominated by its adversaries after its founders ZUINGLE and CALVIN, is entirely different from that of all other ecclesiastical communities. Every other Christian church hath some common center of union, and its members are connected together by some common bond of

The constitution of the Reformed church.

[o] For an ample account of these Lutheran doctors, see MELCHIOR. ADAMI *Vitæ Theologorum*, and LOUIS ELIS DU PIN *Bibliothèque des Auteurs séparés de la Communion de l'Eglise Romaine, du XVII^e Siècle*. The lives of several of these divines have been also separately composed by different authors of the present times; as for example, that of WELLER by LÆMELIUS, that of FLACIUS by RITTER, those of HESHUSIUS and SPANGENBERG by LEUCKFELDT, that of FAGIUS by FEVERLIN, that of CHYTRÆUS by SCHUTZ, that of BUCER by VERPORTENIUS, those of WESTPHAL and ÆPINUS by ARN. GREVIUS, &c.

[(p)] It has already been observed that the denomination of REFORMED, was given to those protestant churches, which did not embrace the doctrine and discipline of LUTHER. The title was first assumed by the French protestants, and afterwards became the common denomination of all the calvinistical churches on the continent. I say, on the continent; since in *England* the term *Reformed* is generally used as standing in opposition to popery alone. Be that as it may; this part of Dr. MÖSHEIM's work would have been perhaps, with more propriety, entitled, *The History of the Reformed Churches*, than *The History of the Reformed Church*. This will appear still more evident from the following Note.]

CENT. XVI. doctrine and discipline. But this is far from being the case of the *Reformed* church [q], whose several branches are neither united by the same system of doctrine, nor by the same mode of worship, nor yet by the same form of government. It is farther to be observed, that this church does not require from its ministers, either uniformity in their private sentiments, or in their public doctrine, but permits them to explain, in different ways, several doctrines of no small moment, provided that the great and fundamental principles of Christianity and the practical precepts of that divine religion be maintained in their original purity. This great community, therefore, may be properly considered as an ecclesiastical body composed of several churches, that vary, more or less, from each other in their form and constitution; but which are preserved, however, from anarchy and schisms by a general spirit of equity and toleration that runs through the whole system, and renders variety of opinion consistent with fraternal union.

The causes that produced this state of things.

II. This, indeed, was not the original state and constitution of the Reformed church, but was the result of a certain combination of events and circumstances, that threw it, by a sort of necessity, into this ambiguous form. The doctors of *Switzerland*, from whom it derived its origin, and CALVIN, who was one of its principal founders, employed all their credit, and exerted their most vigorous efforts in order to reduce all the churches, which embraced their sentiments under one rule of faith, and the same form of ecclesiastical government. And although they considered the Lutherans as their brethren, yet they shewed no marks of indulgence to those, who openly favoured the opinions of LUTHER concerning the *Eucharist*, the *Person of CHRIST*, *Predestination*, and other matters that were connected with these doctrines; nor would they permit the other protestant churches, that

[(q) This and the following observations are designed to give the *Lutheran* church an air of unity, which is not to be found in the *Reformed*. But there is a real fallacy in this specious representation of things. The *Reformed* church, when considered in the true extent of the term *Reformed*, comprehends all those religious communities that separated themselves from the church of *Rome*, and, in this sense, includes the *Lutheran* church, as well as the others. And even when this epithet is used in opposition to the community founded by LUTHER, it represents, not a single church, as the *Episcopal*, *Presbyterian*, or *Independent*, but rather a collection of churches; which, though they be invisibly united by a belief and profession of the *fundamental* doctrines of Christianity, yet frequent *separate* places of worship, and have, each, a *visible* center of *external* union peculiar to themselves, which is formed by certain *peculiarities* in their respective rules of public worship and ecclesiastical government. An attentive examination of the discipline, polity, and worship of the churches of *England*, *Scotland*, *Holland*, and *Switzerland*, will set this matter in the clearest light. The first of these churches being governed by *bishops*, and not admitting of the validity of *presbyterian ordination*, differs from the other three, more than any of these differ from each other. There are however peculiarities of government and worship, that distinguish the church of *Holland* from that of *Scotland*. The institution of *deacons*, the use of forms for the celebration of the sacraments, an ordinary form of prayer, the observation of the festivals of Christmas, Easter, Ascension-day, and Whitsuntide, are established in the Dutch church; and it is well known, that the church of *Scotland* differs from it extremely in these respects.—But after all, to what does the pretended uniformity among the Lutherans amount? are not some of the *Lutheran* churches governed by *bishops*, while others are ruled by *elders*? It shall moreover be shewn in its proper place, that, even in point of doctrine, the *Lutheran* churches are not so very remarkable for their uniformity.]

embraced

embraced their communion, to deviate from their example in this respect. CENT. XVI.
A new scene, however, which was exhibited in *Britain*, contributed much to enlarge this narrow and contracted system of church-communion. For when the violent contest concerning the form of ecclesiastical government, and the nature and number of those rites and ceremonies that were proper to be admitted into the public worship, arose between the abettors of *Episcopacy*, and the *Puritans* [r], it was judged necessary to extend the borders of the Reformed church, and rank in the class of its true members, even those who departed, in some respects, from the ecclesiastical polity and doctrines established at *Geneva*. This spirit of toleration and indulgence grew still more forbearing and comprehensive after the famous synod of *Dort*. For though the sentiments and doctrines of the *Arminians* were rejected and condemned in that numerous assembly, yet they gained ground privately, and insinuated themselves into the minds of many. The church of *England*, under the reign of *CHARLES I.*, publicly renounced the opinions of *CALVIN* relating to the *Divine Decrees*, and made several attempts to model its doctrine and institutions after the laws, tenets, and customs, that were observed by the primitive Christians. On the other hand, several Lutheran congregations in *Germany* entertained a strong propensity to the doctrines and discipline of the church of *Geneva*; though they were restrained from declaring themselves, fully and openly, on this head, by their apprehensions of forfeiting the privileges they derived from their adherence to the confession of *Augsburg*. The French refugees also, who had long been accustomed to a moderate way of thinking in religious matters, and whose national turn led them to a certain freedom of inquiry, being dispersed abroad in all parts of the protestant world, rendered themselves so agreeable, by their wit and eloquence, that their example excited a kind of emulation in favour of religious liberty. All these circumstances accompanied with others, whose influence was less palpable, though equally real, instilled, by degrees, such a spirit of lenity and forbearance into the minds of protestants, that, at this day, all Christians, if we except *Roman-catholics*, *Socinians*, *Quakers*, and *Anabaptists*, may claim a place among the members of the Reformed church. It is true, great reluctance was discovered by many against this comprehensive scheme of church-communion; and, even in the times in which we live, the ancient and less charitable manner of proceeding hath several patrons, who would be glad to see the doctrines and institutions of *CALVIN* universally adopted and rigorously observed. The number, however, of these rigid doctors is not very great, nor is their influence considerable. And it may be affirmed with truth, that, both in point of number and authority, they are much inferior to the friends of moderation, who reduce within a narrow compass the fundamental doctrines of Christianity on the belief of which salvation depends, exercise forbear-

[(r) The *Puritans*, who inclined to the presbyterian form of church-government, of which *KNOX* was one of the earliest abettors in *Britain*, derived this denomination, from their pretending to a purer method of worship than that which had been established by *EDWARD VI* and *Queen ELIZABETH*.]

CENT. XVI.

ance and fraternal charity towards those who explain certain doctrines in a manner peculiar to themselves, and desire to see the enclosure (if I may use that expression) of the Reformed church rendered as large and comprehensive as is possible [s].

The foundation
of the Reformed
church laid by
Zuingle.

III. The founder of the Reformed church was ULRICK ZUINGLE, a native of *Switzerland*, and a man of uncommon penetration and acuteness, accompanied with an ardent zeal for truth. This great man was for removing out of the churches, and abolishing, in the ceremonies and appendages of public worship, many things which LUTHER was disposed to treat with toleration and indulgence, such as images, altars, wax-tapers, the form of *exorcism*, and private confession. He aimed at nothing so much as establishing, in his country, a method and form of divine worship remarkable for its simplicity, and as far remote as could be, from every thing that might have the smallest tendency to nourish a spirit of superstition [t]. Nor were these the only circumstances in which he differed from the Saxon reformer; for his sentiments concerning several points of theology, and more especially his opinions relating to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, varied widely from those of LUTHER. The greatest part of these sentiments and opinions were adopted, in *Switzerland*, by those who had joined themselves to ZUINGLE, in promoting the cause of the reformation, and were by them transmitted to all the Helvetic churches, that threw off the yoke of *Rome*. From *Switzerland* these opinions were propagated among the neighbouring nations, by the ministerial labours and the theological writings of the friends and disciples of ZUINGLE; and thus the primitive Reformed church, that was founded by this eminent ecclesiastic, and whose extent at first was not very considerable, gathered strength by degrees, and made daily new acquisitions.

[s] The annals of theology have not as yet been enriched with a full and accurate *History of the Reformed Church*. This task was indeed undertaken by SCULTET, and even carried down so far as his own time, in his *Annales Evangelii Renovati*; but the greatest part of this work is lost. THEOD. HASÆUS, who proposed to give the *Annals of the Reformed Church*, was prevented by death from fulfilling his purpose. The famous work of JAMES BASNAGE, published in two volumes 4^{to} at *Rotterdam*, in the year 1725, under the title of *Histoire de la Religion des Eglises Reformées*, instead of giving a regular History of the Reformed Church, is only designed to shew, that its peculiar and distinguishing doctrines are not new inventions, but were taught and embraced in the earliest ages of the church.—MAIMBOURG's *Histoire du Calvinisme*, is remarkable for nothing, but the partiality of its author, and the wilful errors with which it abounds.

[(t) The design of ZUINGLE was certainly excellent; but in the execution of it he perhaps went too far, and consulted rather the dictates of reason than the real exigencies of human nature in its present state. The present union between soul and body, which operate together in the actions of moral agents even in those that appear the most abstracted and refined, renders it necessary to consult the *external senses*, as well as the *intellectual powers*, in the institution of public worship. Besides, between a worship purely and philosophically rational and a service grossly and palpably superstitious, there are many intermediate steps and circumstances by which a rational service may be rendered more affecting and awakening without becoming superstitious. A noble edifice, a solemn music, a well ordered set of external gestures, though they do not, in themselves, render our prayers one whit more acceptable to the Deity, than if they were offered up without any of these circumstances, produce, nevertheless, a good effect. They elevate the mind, they give it a composed and solemn frame, and thus contribute to the fervor of its devotion.]

IV. The

IV. The separation between the Lutheran and Swiss churches was chiefly CENT. XVI. occasioned by the doctrine of ZUINGLE, concerning the sacrament of the Lord's supper. LUTHER maintained, that the *body* and *blood* of CHRIST were *really*, though in a manner far beyond human comprehension, *present* in the eucharist, and were exhibited together with the *bread* and *wine*. On the contrary, the Swiss reformer looked upon the *bread* and *wine* in no other light, than as the *signs* and *symbols* of the *absent* body and blood of CHRIST; and, from the year 1524, propagated this doctrine in a public manner by his writings, after having entertained and taught it privately before that period [*u*]. In a little time after this [*w*], his example was followed by OECOLAMPADIUS, a divine of *Basil*, and one of the most learned men of this century [*x*]. But they were both opposed with obstinacy and spirit by LUTHER and his associates, particularly those of the circle of *Suabia*. In the mean time, PHILIP, landgrave of *Hesse*, apprehending the pernicious effects, that these debates might have upon the affairs of the *protestants*, which were, as yet, in that fluctuating and unsettled state that marks the infancy of all great revolutions, was desirous of putting an end to these differences, and appointed, for that purpose, a conference at *Marpurg* between ZUINGLE, LUTHER, and other doctors of both parties [*y*]. This meeting, however, only covered the flame, instead of extinguishing it; and the pacific prince, seeing it impossible to bring about a definitive treaty of peace and concord between these jarring divines, was obliged to rest satisfied with having engaged them to consent to a truce. LUTHER and ZUINGLE came to an agreement about several points; but the principal matter in debate, even that which regarded CHRIST's presence in the eucharist, was left undecided; each party appealing to the fountain of wisdom, to terminate this controversy, and expressing their hopes that time and impartial reflexion might discover and confirm the truth [*z*].

The controversy between the Lutherans and Reformed concerning the eucharist.

V. The Reformed church had scarcely been founded in *Switzerland* by ZUINGLE, when this Christian hero fell in a battle that was fought, in the year 1530, between the protestants of *Zurich* and their Roman-catholic compatriots, who drew the sword in defence of popery. It was not indeed to perform the sanguinary office of a soldier that ZUINGLE was present at this engagement, but with a view to encourage and animate, by his counsels

The progress of these disputes so far down as the death of Luther.

[*u*] ZUINGLE certainly taught this doctrine in private before the year 1524, as appears from GERDES, *Historia Renovat. Evangelii*, tom. i. *Append.* p. 228.

[*w*] In the year 1525.

[*x*] JO. CONR. FUESLINI *Centuria I, Epistol. Theolog. Reformat.* p. 31. 35. 44. 49.—[OECOLAMPADIUS was not less remarkable for his extraordinary modesty, his charitable, forbearing, and pacific spirit, and his zeal for the progress of vital and *practical* religion, than for his profound erudition, which he seemed rather studious to conceal than to display.]

[*y*] ZUINGLE was accompanied by OECOLAMPADIUS, BUCER, and HEDION. LUTHER had with him MELANCTHON and JUSTUS JONAS from *Saxony*, together with OSIANDER, BRENTIUS, and AGRICOLA.]

[*z*] RUCHAT, *Histoire de la Reformation de la Suisse*, vol. i. *passim.* vol. ii. livr. vi. p. 463.—HOTTINGER, *Helvetische Kirchen-Geschichte*, part. III. p. 27. 51. 483.—VAL. ERN. LOSCHERI *Historia Motuum*, part. i. cap. ii, iii. p. 55. cap. vi. p. 143.—FUESLIN, *Beiträge zur Schweizer-Reformation*, tom. iv. p. 120.

and:

CENT. XVI. and exhortations, the valiant defenders of the protestant cause [a]. After his death, several Lutheran doctors of the more moderate sort, and particularly MARTIN BUCER, used their utmost endeavours to bring about some kind of reconciliation between the contending parties. For this purpose they exhorted the jarring theologians to concord, interpreted the points in dispute with a prudent regard to the prejudices of both sides, admonished them of the pernicious consequences that must attend the prolongation of these unhappy contests, and even went so far as to express the respective sentiments of the contending doctors in terms of considerable ambiguity and latitude, that thus the desired union might be the more easily effected. There is no doubt, but that the intentions and designs of these zealous intercessors were pious and upright [b]; but it will be difficult to decide, whether or no the means they employed were adapted to promote the end they had in view. Be that as it may, these pacific counsels of BUCER excited divisions in *Switzerland*; for some persevered obstinately in the doctrine of ZUINGLE, while others adopted the explications and modifications of his doctrine that were offered by BUCER [c]. But these divisions and commotions had not the least effect on that reconciliation with LUTHER, that was earnestly desired by the pious and moderate doctors on both sides. The efforts of BUCER were more successful out of *Switzerland*, and particularly among those divines in the upper parts of *Germany*, who inclined to the sentiments of the Helvetic church; for they retired from the communion of that church, and joined themselves to LUTHER by a public act, which was sent to *Wittenberg*, in the year 1536, by a solemn deputation appointed for that purpose [d]. The Swiss divines could not be brought to so great a length. There was, however, still some prospect of effecting a reconciliation between them and the Lutherans. But this fair prospect entirely disappeared in the year 1544, when LUTHER published his *Confession* of faith in relation to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, which was directly opposite to the doctrine of ZUINGLE and his followers, on that head. The doctors of *Zurich* pleaded their cause publicly against the Saxon reformer, the year following; and, thus, the purposes of the peace-makers were totally defeated [e].

[a] The Lutherans, who consider this unhappy fate of ZUINGLE as a reproach upon that great man in particular, and upon the Reformed church in general, discover a gross ignorance of the genius and manners of the Swiss nation in this century. For as all the inhabitants of that country are at present trained to arms, and obliged to take the field, when the defence of their country requires it, so in the time of ZUINGLE this obligation was so universal, that neither the ministers of the gospel, nor the professors of theology, were exempted from this military service. Accordingly in the same battle, in which ZUINGLE fell, JEROME POTANUS, one of the theological doctors of *Basil*, also lost his life. See FUESLINI *Centuria I, Epistolar. Theol. Reformatar.* p. 84.

[b] See ALB. MENON. VERPOORTEN, *Comment. de Mart. Bucero et ejus Sententia de Coena Domini*, § ix. p. 23. published in 8^{vo} at *Coburg*, in the year 1709.—LOSCHERI *Histor. Motuum*, part. I. lib. ii. cap. i. p. 181. & part. ii. lib. iii. cap. ii. p. 15.

[c] FUESLINI *Centur. I, Epistolar. Theolog.* p. 162. 170. 181, 182. 190, &c.

[d] LOSCHERUS, *loc. cit.* cap. ii. p. 205.—RUCHAT, *Histoire de la Reformat. de la Suisse*, tom. v. p. 535.—HOTTINGERI *Histor. Eccles. Helvet.* tom. iii. lib. vi. p. 702.

[e] LOSCHERUS, *loc. cit.* part. i. lib. ii. cap. iv. p. 241.

VI. The death of LUTHER, which happened in the year 1546, was an event that seemed adapted to calm these commotions, and to revive, in the breasts of the moderate and pacific, the hopes of a reconciliation between the contending parties. For this union, between the Lutherans and Zuinglians, was so ardently desired by MELANCTHON and his followers, that this great man left no means unemployed to bring it about, and seemed resolved rather to submit to a dubious and forced peace, than to see those flaming discords perpetuated, which reflected such dishonour on the protestant cause. On the other hand, this salutary work seemed to be facilitated by the theological system that was adopted by JOHN CALVIN, a native of Noyon in France, who was pastor and professor of divinity at Geneva, and whose genius, learning, eloquence, and talents rendered him respectable even in the eyes of his enemies. This great man, whose particular friendship for MELANCTHON was an incidental circumstance highly favourable to the intended reconciliation, proposed an explication of the point in debate, that modified the crude hypothesis of ZUINGLE, and made use of all his credit and authority among the Swiss, and more particularly at Zurich, where he was held in the highest veneration, in order to obtain their assent to it [f]. The explication he proposed was not, indeed, favourable to the doctrine of CHRIST's bodily presence in the eucharist, which he persisted in denying; he supposed, however, that a certain *divine virtue* or *efficacy* was communicated by CHRIST with the *bread* and *wine*, to those who approached this holy sacrament with a lively faith, and with upright hearts; and to render this notion still more satisfactory, he expressed it in almost the same terms which the Lutherans employed in inculcating their doctrine of CHRIST's real presence in the eucharist [g]. For the great and common error of all those, who, from a desire of peace, assumed the character of arbitrators in this controversy, lay in this, that they aimed rather at a uniformity of *terms*, than of *sentiments*; and seemed satisfied when they had engaged the contending parties to use the same *words* and phrases, though their real difference in opinion remained the same, and each explained these ambiguous or figurative terms in a manner agreeable to their respective systems.

The transactions that succeeded the death of Luther.

The concord, so much desired, did not, however, seem to advance much. MELANCTHON, who stood foremost in the rank of those, who longed impatiently for it, had not courage enough to embark openly in the execution of such a perilous project. Besides, after the death of LUTHER, his enemies attacked him with redoubled fury, and gave him so much disagreeable occupation, that he had neither that leisure, nor that tranquillity of mind that were necessary to prepare his measures properly for such an arduous undertaking. A new obstacle to the execution of this pacific project was also

[f] CHRIST. AUG. SALIG. *Historia Aug. Confession.* tom. ii. lib. vii. cap. iii. p. 1075.

[g] CALVIN went certainly too far in this matter; and, in his explication of the benefits that arise from a worthy commemoration of CHRIST's death in the eucharist, he dwelt too grossly upon the *allegorical* expressions of scripture, which the papists had so egregiously abused, and talked of *really eating by faith the body* and *drinking the blood* of CHRIST.]

CENT. XVI. presented by the intemperate zeal of JOACHIM WESTPHAL, pastor at Hamburg, who, in the year 1552, renewed, with greater vehemence than ever, this deplorable controversy, which had been for some time suspended, and who, after FLACIUS, was the most obstinate defender of the opinions of LUTHER. This violent theologian attacked with that spirit of acrimony and vehemence, that was too remarkable in the polemic writings of LUTHER, the act of uniformity by which the churches of Geneva and Zurich declared their agreement concerning the doctrine of the eucharist. In the book which he published with this view [h], he censured with the utmost severity, the variety of sentiments concerning the sacrament of the Lord's supper that was observable in the Reformed church, and maintained, with his usual warmth and obstinacy, the opinion of LUTHER on that subject. This engaged CALVIN to enter the lists with WESTPHAL, whom he treated with as little lenity and forbearance, as the rigid Lutheran had shewed towards the Helvetic churches. The consequences of this debate were, that CALVIN and WESTPHAL had each their zealous defenders and patrons: hence the breach widened, the spirits were heated, and the flame of controversy was kindled anew with such violence and fury, that, to extinguish it entirely, seemed to be a task beyond the reach of human wisdom or human power [i].

The controversy concerning predestination.

VII. These disputes were unhappily augmented in process of time, by that famous controversy concerning the decrees of God, with respect to the eternal condition of men, which was set on foot by CALVIN, and became an inexhaustible source of intricate researches and abstruse, subtle, and inexplicable questions. The most ancient Helvetic doctors were far from adopting the doctrine of those, who represent the Deity, as allotting from all eternity by an *absolute, arbitrary, and unconditional* decree, to some, everlasting happiness, and to others, endless misery, without any *previous* regard to the moral characters and circumstances of either. Their sentiments seemed to differ but very little from those of the Pelagians; nor did they hesitate in declaring after the example of ZUINGLE, that the kingdom of heaven was open to all who lived according to the dictates of right reason [k]. CALVIN had adopted a quite different system with respect to the divine decrees. He maintained, that the everlasting condition of mankind in a future world

[h] This book, which abounds with senseless and extravagant tenets that LUTHER never so much as thought of, and breaths the most virulent spirit of persecution, is entitled, *Farrago confusaneorum et inter se dissidentium de S. Coena opinionum ex Sacramentariis Libris congesta.*

[i] LOSCHERI *Historia Motuum*, part. II. lib. iii. cap. viii. p. 83.—MÖLLERI *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. iii. p. 642.—ARN. GREVII *Memoria JOAC. WESTPHALI*, p. 62. 106.

[k] For the proof of this assertion, see DALLEI *Apologia pro duabus Ecclesiarum Gallicar. Synodis adversus Frid. Spanheim.* part. IV. p. 946.—JO. ALPHONS. TURRETINI *Epistol. ad Antistitem Cantuariensem*, which is inserted in the *Bibliothèque Germanique*, tom. xiii. p. 92.—SIMON, *Bibliothèque Critique*, published under the fictitious name of SAINIOR, tom. iii. ch. xxviii. p. 292. 298. and also the author of a book, entitled, *Observationes Gallicæ in Formul. Consensus Helveticæ*, p. 52. The very learned Dr. GERDES, instead of being persuaded by these testimonies, maintains, on the contrary, in his *Miscellan. Groningens.* tom. ii. p. 476, 477. that the sentiments of CALVIN were the same with those of the ancient Swiss doctors. But this excellent author may be refuted, even from his own account of the tumults, that were occasioned in Switzerland by the opinion that CALVIN had propagated in relation to the Divine Decrees.

was

was determined from all eternity by the *unchangeable order* of the Deity, and that this *absolute* determination of his *will* and *good pleasure* was the *only* source of happiness or misery to every individual. This opinion was, in a very short time, propagated through all the Reformed churches by the writings of CALVIN, and by the ministry of his disciples, and, in some places, was inserted in the national creeds and confessions; and thus made a public article of faith. The unhappy controversy, which took its rise from this doctrine, was opened at *Strasburg*, in the year 1560, by JEROME ZANCHIUS, an Italian ecclesiastic, who was particularly attached to the sentiments of CALVIN; and was afterwards carried on by others with such zeal and assiduity, that it drew, in an extraordinary manner, the attention of the public, and tended as much to exasperate the passions and foment the discord of the contending parties, as the dispute about the eucharist had already done [1].

VIII. The Helvetic doctors had no prospect left of calming the troubled spirits, and tempering, at least, the vehemence of these deplorable feuds, but the moderation of the Saxon divines, who were the disciples of MELANCTHON, and who, breathing the pacific spirit of their master, seemed, after his death, to have nothing so much at heart as the restoration of concord and union in the protestant church. Their designs, however, were not carried on with that caution and circumspection, with that prudent foresight, or that wise attention to the nature of the times, which distinguished always the transactions of MELANCTHON, and which the critical nature of the cause they were engaged in, indispensably required. And hence they had already taken a step, which was adapted to render ineffectual all the remedies they could apply to the healing of the present disorders. For, by dispersing every where artful and insidious writings with a design to seduce the ministers of the church and the studious youth into the sentiments of the Swiss divines, or, at least, to engage them to treat these sentiments with toleration and forbearance, they drew upon themselves the indignation of their adversaries, and ruined the pacific cause in which they had embarked. It was this conduct of theirs that gave occasion to the composition of that famous *Form of Concord*, which condemned the sentiments of the Reformed churches in relation to the *person* of CHRIST and the *sacrament* of the Lord's supper. And as this *Form* is received by the greatest part of the Lutherans, as one of the articles of their religion, hence arises an insuperable obstacle to all schemes of reconciliation and concord.

The discord is carried to the greatest height.

IX. So much did it seem necessary to premise concerning the causes, rise, and progress of the controversy, which formed that separation that still subsists between the Lutheran and Reformed churches. From thence it will be proper to proceed to an account of the internal state of the latter, and to the history of its progress and revolutions. The history of the Reformed church, during this century, comprehends two distinct periods. The first

What those things are, that are most worthy of observation in the rise and progress of the Reformed church,

[1] LOSCHER *Historia Motuum*, part. III. lib. v. cap. ii. p. 27. S. c. x. p. 227.—SALIG. *Historia August. Confession.* tom. i. lib. ii. cap. xiii. p. 441.

CENT. XVI. commences with the year 1519, when ZUINGLE withdrew from the communion of *Rome*, and began to form a Christian church beyond the bounds of the papal jurisdiction, and it extends to the time of CALVIN's settlement at *Geneva*, where he acquired the greatest reputation and authority. The second period takes in the rest of this century.

During the first of these periods the Helvetic church, which assumed the title of *Reformed*, after the example of the French protestants in their neighbourhood, who had chosen this denomination in order to distinguish themselves from the Roman-catholics, was very inconsiderable in its extent and was confined to the cantons of *Switzerland*. It was, indeed, augmented by the accession of some small states in *Suabia* and *Alsace*, such as the city of *Strasbourg*, and some little republics. But, in the year 1536, these petty states changed sides through the suggestions and influence of BUCER, returned to the communion of the Saxon church, and thus made their peace with LUTHER. The other religious communities, which abandoned the church of *Rome*, either openly embraced the doctrine of LUTHER, or consisted of persons, who were not agreed in their theological opinions, and who really seemed to stand in a kind of neutrality between the contending parties. All things being duly considered, it appears probable enough that the church founded by ZUINGLE would have remained still confined to the narrow limits, which bounded it at first, had not CALVIN arisen to augment its extent, authority, and lustre. For the natural and political character of the Swiss, which is neither bent towards the lust of conquest, nor the grasping views of ambition, discovered itself in their religious transactions. And, as a spirit of contentment with what they had, prevented their aiming at an augmentation of their territory, so did a similar spirit hinder them from being extremely solicitous about enlarging the borders of their church.

The religious points that first excited divisions between the Swiss and the Lutherans.

X. In this infant state of the *Reformed* church, the only point, that prevented its union with the followers of LUTHER, was the doctrine they taught with respect to the *sacrament of the Lord's supper*. This first controversy, indeed, soon produced a second, relating to the *person of JESUS CHRIST*, which nevertheless, concerned only a part of the Lutheran church [m]. The Lutheran divines of *Suabia*, in the course of their debates with those of *Switzerland*, drew an argument in favour of the real presence of CHRIST's body and blood in the eucharist from the following proposition; that *all the PROPERTIES of the divine nature, and consequently its OMNIPRESENCE, were communicated to the human nature of CHRIST by the hypostatic union*. The Swiss doctors, in order to destroy the force of this argument, denied this *communication of the divine attributes to CHRIST's human nature*, and denied, more especially, the *ubiquity or omnipresence* of the

[(m) It was only a certain number of those Lutherans, that were much more rigid in their doctrine than LUTHER himself, that believed the *Ubiquity or Omnipresence* of CHRIST's person, considered as a *Man*. By this we may see, that the *Lutherans* have their divisions, as well as the *Reformed*, of which several instances may be yet given in the course of this history.]

man JESUS. And hence arose that most intricate and abstruse controversy concerning ubiquity and the communication of properties, that produced so many learned and unintelligible treatises, so many subtle disputes, and occasioned that multitude of invectives and accusations, that the contending parties threw out against each other with such liberality and profusion.

It is proper to observe, that, at this time, the Helvetic church universally embraced the doctrine of ZUINGLE concerning the eucharist. This doctrine, which differed considerably from that of CALVIN, amounted to the following propositions: "That the bread and wine were no more than a representation of the body and blood of CHRIST, or, in other words, the signs appointed to denote the benefits that were conferred upon mankind in consequence of the death of CHRIST; that therefore, Christians derived no other fruit from the participation of the Lord's supper, than a mere commemoration and remembrance of the merits of CHRIST, which, according to an expression common in the mouths of the abettors of this doctrine, was the only thing that was properly meant by the Lord's supper [n]." BUCER, whose leading principle was the desire of peace and concord, endeavoured to correct and modify this doctrine in such a manner, as to give it a certain degree of conformity to the hypothesis of LUTHER; but the memory of ZUINGLE was too fresh in the minds of the Swiss to permit their accepting of these corrections and modifications, or to suffer them to depart, in any respect, from the doctrine of that eminent man, who had founded their church, and been the instrument of their deliverance from the tyranny and superstition of Rome.

XI. In the year 1541, JOHN CALVIN, who surpassed almost all the doctors of this age in laborious application, constancy of mind, force of eloquence, and extent of genius, returned to Geneva, from whence the opposition of his enemies had obliged him to retire. On his settlement in that city the affairs of the new church were committed to his direction [o], and he acquired also a high degree of influence in the political administration of that republic. This event changed entirely the face of affairs, and gave a new aspect to the Reformed church. The views and projects of this great man were grand and extensive. For he not only undertook to give strength and vigour to the rising church, by framing the wisest laws and the most salutary institutions for the maintenance of order and the advancement of

John Calvin the principal founder of the Reformed church.

[n] *Nil esse in Coena, quam memoriam Christi.* That this was the real opinion of ZUINGLE appears evidently from various testimonies, which may be seen in the *Museum Helveticum*, tom. i. p. 485. 490. tom. iii. p. 631.—This is also confirmed by the following sentence in ZUINGLE's book concerning *Baptism*: (tom. ii. Opp. p. 85.) *Coena Dominica non aliud, quam Commemorationis nomen meretur.* Compare with all this FUESLINI *Centur. I. Epistolar. Theologor. Reformator.* p. 255. 262, &c.

[o] CALVIN, in reality, enjoyed the power and authority of a bishop at Geneva; for, as long as he lived, he presided in the assembly of the clergy, and in the *Consistory* or ecclesiastical judicatory. But when he was at the point of death, he advised the clergy not to give him a successor, and proved to them evidently the dangerous consequences of entrusting with any one man, during life, a place of such high authority. After him, therefore, the place of president ceased to be perpetual. See SPON, *Histoire de Geneve*, tom. ii. p. 111.

CENT. XVI.

true piety, but even proposed to render *Geneva*, the mother, the seminary of all the *Reformed* churches, as *Wittemberg* was of all the *Lutheran* communities. He laid a scheme for sending forth from this little republic the succours and ministers that were to promote and propagate the protestant cause through the most distant nations, and aimed at nothing less, than rendering the government, discipline, and doctrine of *Geneva* the model and rule of imitation to the *Reformed* churches throughout the world. The undertaking was certainly great, and worthy of the extensive genius and capacity of this eminent man; and, great and arduous as it was, it was executed in part, nay, carried on to a very considerable length by his indefatigable assiduity and inextinguishable zeal. It was with this view, that by the fame of his learning, as well as by his epistolary solicitations and encouragements of various kinds, he engaged many persons of rank and fortune in *France*, *Italy*, and other countries, to leave the places of their nativity, and to settle at *Geneva*; while others repaired thither merely out of a curiosity to see a man, whose talents and exploits had rendered him so famous, and to hear the discourses which he delivered in public. Another circumstance, that contributed much to the success of his designs, was the establishment of an academy at *Geneva*, which the senate of that city founded at his request; and in which he himself, with his colleague THEODORE BEZA, and other divines of eminent learning and abilities, taught the sciences with the greatest reputation. In effect, the lustre, which these great men reflected upon this infant seminary of learning, spread its fame through the distant nations with such amazing rapidity, that all, who were ambitious of a distinguished progress in either sacred or profane erudition, repaired to *Geneva*, and that *England*, *Scotland*, *France*, *Italy*, and *Germany* seemed to vie with each other in the numbers of their studious youth, that were incessantly repairing to the new academy. By these means, and by the ministry of these, his disciples, CALVIN enlarged considerably the borders of the *Reformed* church, propagated his doctrine, and gained profelytes and patrons to his theological system, in several countries of *Europe*. In the midst of this glorious career he ended his days in the year 1564; but the salutary institutions and wise regulations, of which he had been the author, were both respected and maintained after his death. In a more especial manner the academy of *Geneva* flourished as much under BEZA, as it had done during the life of its founder [p].

The form of doctrine and ecclesiastical government drawn up by this Reformer.

XII. The plan of doctrine and discipline, that had been formed by ZUINGLE, was altered and corrected by CALVIN; and that, more especially,

[p] The various projects and plans that were formed, conducted, and executed with equal prudence and resolution by CALVIN in behalf, both of the republic and church of *Geneva*, are related by the learned person, who, in the year 1730, gave a new edition (enriched with interesting historical notes, and authentic documents) of SPON's *Histoire de Geneve*. The particular accounts of CALVIN's transactions, given by this anonymous editor, in his notes, are drawn from several curious manuscripts, of undoubted credit. See SPON, *Histoire de Geneve*, tom. ii. p. 87. 100, &c.

in three points, of which it will not be improper to give a particular account. CENT. XVI.

1st, ZUINGLE, in his form of ecclesiastical government, had given an absolute and unbounded power, in religious matters, to the civil magistrate, to whom he had placed the clergy in a degree of subjection that was displeasing to many. But, at the same time, he allowed of a certain subordination and difference of rank among the ministers of the church, and even thought it expedient to place at their head a perpetual president or superintendent with a certain degree of inspection and authority over the whole body. CALVIN, on the contrary, reduced the power of the magistrate, in religious matters, within narrow bounds. He declared the church a separate and independent body, endowed with the power of legislation for itself. He maintained, that it was to be governed, like the primitive church, only by *presbyteries* and *synods*, that is, by assemblies of *elders*, composed both of the clergy and laity; and he left to the civil magistrate little else than the privilege of protecting and defending the church, and providing for what related to its external exigencies and concerns. Thus this eminent Reformer introduced into the republic of *Geneva*, and endeavoured to introduce into all the Reformed churches throughout *Europe*, that Form of ecclesiastical government, which is called *Presbyterian*, from its neither admitting of the institution of bishops, nor of any subordination among the clergy; and which is founded on this principle, that all ministers of the gospel are, by the law of God, declared to be equal in rank and authority. In consequence of this principle, he established, at *Geneva*, a *consistory*, composed of *ruling elders*, partly *pastors*, and partly *laymen*, and invested this ecclesiastical body with a high degree of power and authority. He also convened synods, composed of the ruling elders of different churches, and in these consistories and synods had laws enacted for the regulation of all matters of a religious nature; and, among other things, restored to its former vigour the ancient practice of *excommunication*. All these things were done with the consent of the greatest part of the senate of *Geneva*.

2^{dly}, The system that ZUINGLE had adopted with respect to the eucharist was by no means agreeable to CALVIN, who, in order to facilitate the desired union with the Lutheran church, substituted in its place another, which appeared more conformable to the doctrine of that church, and, in reality, differed but little from it. For while the doctrine of ZUINGLE supposed only a *symbolical*, or figurative, *presence* of the body and blood of CHRIST in the eucharist, and represented a pious remembrance of CHRIST's death, and of the benefits it procured to mankind, as the only fruits that arose from the celebration of the Lord's supper, CALVIN explained this critical point in a quite different manner. He acknowledged a *real*, though *spiritual*, *presence* of CHRIST in this sacrament; or, in other words, he maintained, that true Christians, who approached this holy ordinance with a lively faith, were, in a certain manner, united to the man CHRIST; and that from this union the spiritual life derived new vigour in the soul, and was still carried on, in a progressive motion, to greater degrees of purity and

CENT. XVI. and perfection. This kind of language had been used in the forms of doctrine, drawn up by LUTHER; and as CALVIN observed, among other things, that the *divine grace* was *conferred* upon sinners, and *sealed* to them by the celebration of the Lord's supper, this induced many to suppose that he adopted the sentiment implied in the barbarous term *impanation* [q], and differed but little from the doctrine of the Lutheran church on this important subject [r]. Be that as it may, his sentiments differed considerably from those of ZUINGLE; for while the latter asserted, that all Christians, without distinction, whether *regenerate* or *unregenerate*, might be partakers of the body and blood of CHRIST; CALVIN confined this privilege to the pious and *regenerate* believer alone.

3dly, The *absolute decree* of God, with respect to the future and everlasting condition of the human race, which made no part of the theology of ZUINGLE, was an essential tenet in the creed of CALVIN, who inculcated with zeal the following doctrine: *That God, in predestinating, from all eternity, one part of mankind to everlasting happiness, and another to endless misery, was led to make this distinction by no other motive than his own GOOD PLEASURE and FREE WILL.*

XIII. The first of the three points now mentioned, was of such a nature, that great as the credit and influence of CALVIN were, he could not pro-

These changes made by Calvin are not approved of, nor received by all the Reformed churches.

[(q) The term *Impanation* (which signifies here the *presence* of CHRIST's body in the eucharist, in or with the bread, that is there exhibited) amounts to what is called *Consubstantiation*. It was a modification of the monstrous doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, first, invented by some of the disciples of BERENGER, who had not a mind to break all measures with the church of Rome, and was afterwards adopted by LUTHER and his followers, who, in reality, made sad work of it. For in order to give it some faint air of possibility, and to maintain it as well as they could, they fell into a wretched scholastic jargon about the nature of *substances*, *subsistences*, *attributes*, *properties*, and *accidents*, that did infinite mischief to the true and sublime science of gospel theology, whose beautiful simplicity it was adapted to destroy. The very same perplexity and darkness, the same quibbling, sophistical, and unintelligible logic that reigned in the attempts of the Roman-catholics to defend the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, were visible in the controversial writings of the Lutherans in behalf of *Consubstantiation*, or *Impanation*. The latter had, indeed, one absurdity less to maintain; but being obliged to assert in opposition to intuitive evidence, and unchangeable truth, that the *same* body can be in *many* places at the same time, they were consequently obliged to have recourse to the darkest and most intricate jargon of the schools to hide the nonsense of this unaccountable doctrine. The modern Lutherans are grown somewhat wiser in this respect; at least they seem less zealous than their ancestors about the tenet in question.]

[r] See FUESLINI *Centur. I, Epistol. Theolog. Reformat.* tom. i. p. 255. 260. 262, 263.—*Lettres de Calvin à Mons. Jac. de Falaise*, p. 84, 85.—We learn in FUESLIN, p. 263. that CALVIN wrote to BUCER a letter intimating that he approved of his sentiments. It is possible, that he may have derived from BUCER the opinion he entertained with respect to the eucharist.—See BOSSUET, *Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes*, tom. ii. p. 8. 14. 19.—COURAYER, *Examen des Defauts des Theologiens*, tom. ii. p. 72. These two writers pretend, that the sentiments of CALVIN, with respect to the eucharist, were almost the same with those of the Roman-catholics*. The truth of the matter is, that the obscurity and inconsistency, with which this great man expressed himself upon that subject, render it extremely difficult to give a clear and accurate account of his doctrine.

* How it could come into the heads of such men as BOSSUET and doctor COURAYER to say, that the *sentiments* of CALVIN concerning the eucharist were almost the same with those of the Roman-catholics, is, indeed, strange enough. The doctrine of *Transubstantiation* was to CALVIN an invincible obstacle to any sort of conformity between him and Rome on that subject. For however obscure and figurative his expressions with respect to CHRIST's *spiritual* presence in the eucharist may have been, he never once dreamed of any thing like a *corporal* presence in that Holy Sacrament.

CURE

cure a universal reception for it in the Reformed churches. The English and Germans rejected it, and even the Swiss refused to adopt it. It was, however, received by the Reformed churches in *France, Holland, and Scotland*. The Swiss remained firm in their opposition: they would not suffer the form of ecclesiastical government, that had once been established, under the inspection of ZUINGLE, to be changed in any respect, nor the power of the civil magistrate, in religious matters, to receive the smallest prejudice. The other two points were long debated, even in *Switzerland*, with the greatest warmth. Several churches, more especially those of *Zurich and Bern*, maintained obstinately the doctrine of ZUINGLE in relation to the eucharist [s]; neither could they be easily persuaded to admit, as an article of faith, the doctrine of *predestination*, as it had been taught by CALVIN [t]. The prudence, however, of this great man, seconded by his resolute perseverance and his extraordinary credit, triumphed at length so far, as to bring about an union between the Swiss churches and that of *Geneva*, first in relation to the doctrine of the eucharist [u], and afterwards also on the subject of *predestination* [w]. The followers of CALVIN extended still farther the triumphs of their chief, and improved, with such success, the footing he had gained, that, in process of time, almost all the Reformed churches adopted his theological system, to which, no doubt, his learned writings contributed a good deal [x].

XIV. It will not be improper to pass in review the different countries, in which the doctrine and discipline of the Reformed church, as modelled by CALVIN, were established in a fixed and permanent manner. Among its chief patrons in *Germany* we may reckon FREDERICK III, elector *Palatine*, who, in the year 1560, removed from their pastoral functions the Lutheran doctors, and filled their places with Calvinists; and, at the same time, obliged his subjects to embrace the tenets, rites, and institutions of the church of *Geneva* [y]. This order was indeed abrogated, in the year 1576, by his son and successor LEWIS, who restored Lutheranism to its former credit and authority. The effects of this revolution were, however, but transitory; for, in the year 1583, under the government of the elector JOHN CASIMIR, who had followed the example of his brother FREDERICK

The progress of
Calvin's system,
in *Germany*

[s] See FUESLINI *Centur. Epistolar.* p. 264.—*Museum Helvet.* tom. i. p. 490. tom. v. p. 479. 483. 490. tom. ii. p. 79.

[t] Besides RUCHAT and HOTTINGER, see *Museum Helveticum*, tom. ii. p. 105. 107. 117.—GERDES, *Miscellan. Groningens. Nova*, tom. ii. p. 476, 477.

[u] The agreement between the churches of *Switzerland* and that of *Geneva* was concluded in 1549 and 1554.

[w] See the *Consensus Genev. et Tigurinor.* in CALVINI *Opusculis*, p. 754.

[x] The learned DAN. ERN. JABLONSKY, in his *Letters to Leibnitz*, published by KAPPIUS, maintains, (p. 24, 25. 41.) that the opinion of ZUINGLE has no longer any patrons among the Reformed. But this is a palpable mistake. For its patrons and defenders are, on the contrary, extremely numerous; and at this very time the doctrine of ZUINGLE is revived in *England, Switzerland*, and other countries, and seems to acquire new degrees of credit from day to day.

[y] HEN. ALTINGII *Hist. Eccl. Palat.* in LUD. CHR. MIEGII *Monum. Palat.* tom. i. p. 223.—LOSCHERI *Historia Motuum*, part. II. lib. iv. cap. iv. p. 125.—SALIG. *Hist. Confession. Aug.* tom. iii. lib. ix. cap. v. p. 433.

CENT. XVI. in embracing the discipline of the Reformed church, the face of things was again changed in favour of Calvinism, which resumed what it had lost, and became triumphant [z]. From this period the church of the Palatinate obtained the second place among the Reformed churches; and its influence and reputation were so considerable, that the *Form of instruction*, which was composed for its use by URSINUS, and which is known under the title of the *Catechism of Heidelberg*, was almost universally adopted by the Calvinists [a]. The republic of *Bremen* embraced, also, the doctrine and institutions of the Reformed. ALBERT HARDENBERG, the intimate friend of MELANCTHON, was the first who attempted to introduce there the doctrine of CALVIN concerning the eucharist. This attempt he made so early as the year 1556; and, though a powerful opposition rendered it unsuccessful, and procured the expulsion of its author out of the city of *Bremen*, yet the latent seeds of Calvinism took root, and, towards the conclusion of this century, acquired such strength, that no measures either of prudence or force were sufficient to prevent the church of *Bremen* from modelling its faith, worship, and government after that of *Geneva* [b]. The various motives, that engaged other German states to adopt, by degrees, the same sentiments, and the incidents and circumstances that favoured the progress of Calvinism in the empire, must be sought in those writers, who have undertaken to give a full, compleat, and ample history of the Christian church.

and in *France*.

XV. Those among the French, who first renounced the jurisdiction and doctrine of the church of *Rome*, are commonly called Lutherans by the writers of these early times. This denomination, joined to other circumstances, has engaged some to imagine, that these French converts to the protestant cause were attached to the tenets of the Lutheran church, and averse to those of the Swiss doctors [c]. But this is by no means a just representation of the matter. It appears much more probable, that the first French protestants were uniform in nothing but their antipathy to the church of *Rome*, and that, this point being excepted, there was a great variety in their religious sentiments. It is, however, to be observed, that the vicinity of *Geneva*, *Lausanne*, and other cities, which had adopted the doctrine of CALVIN, together with the incredible zeal of this eminent man, and his two colleagues FAREL and BEZA, in nourishing the opposition to the church of *Rome*, and augmenting both the indignation and number of its enemies, produced a very remarkable effect upon the French churches; for, about the middle of this century, they all, without exception, entered into

[z] ALTING, *loc. cit.*—LOSCHERUS, *ibid.* part. III. lib. vi. p. 234.—See also a German work, entitled, GOTTH. STRUVIUS, *Pfaelzische Kirchen Historie*, p. 110.

[a] For an account of the *Catechism of Heidelberg*, see KOCHERI *Bibliotheca Theologiae Symbolica*, p. 593 and 308.

[b] SALIG, *loc. cit.* part. III. lib. x. cap. v. p. 715. & cap. vi. p. 776.—LOSCHERUS, *loc. cit.* part. II. lib. iv. cap. v. p. 134. & part. III. lib. vi. cap. vii. p. 276.—GERDES, *Historia Renovati Evangelii*, tom. iii. p. 157.

[c] LOSCHERI *Historia Motuum*, part. II. cap. vi. p. 46.—SALIG, *Hist. Aug. Confession.* tom. ii. lib. v. cap. vi. p. 190.

the bonds of fraternal communion with the church of Geneva. The French protestants were called, by their enemies, *Huguenots*, by way of derision and contempt; the origin, however, of this denomination is extremely uncertain [d]. Their fate was severe; the storms of persecution assailed them with unparalleled fury; and, though many princes of the royal blood and a great number of the flower of the nobility adopted their sentiments and stood forth in their cause [e], yet it may nevertheless be affirmed, that no other part of the Reformed church suffered so grievously as they did, for the sake of religion. Even the peace, which they obtained from HENRY III in the year 1576, was the source of that civil war in which the powerful and ambitious house of *Guise*, instigated by the sanguinary suggestions of the Roman pontiffs, aimed at nothing less than the extirpation of the royal family, and the utter ruin of the protestant religion; while the Huguenots, on the other hand, headed by leaders of the most heroic valour and the most illustrious rank, combated for their religion and for their sovereigns with various success. These dreadful commotions, in which both the contending parties committed such deeds, as are yet, and always will be remembered with horror, were, at length, calmed by the fortitude and prudence of HENRY IV. This monarch, indeed, sacrificed the dictates of conscience to the suggestions of policy, and imagining, that his government could have no stable, nor solid foundation, as long as he persisted in disowning the authority and jurisdiction of *Rome*, he renounced the Reformed religion, and made a solemn and public profession of popery. Perceiving however, on the other hand, that it was not possible either to extirpate or suppress entirely the protestant religion, he granted to its professors by the famous edict, drawn up at *Nantes* in the year 1598, the liberty of serving God according to their consciences [f], and a full security for the

[d] Some etymologists suppose this term derived from *HUGUON*, a word used in *Touraine*, to signify persons that walk at night in the streets. And as the first protestants, like the first Christians, may have chosen that season for their religious assemblies through the fear of persecution, the nickname of *Huguenot* may, naturally enough, have been applied to them by their enemies. Others are of opinion, that it was derived from a French and faulty pronunciation of the German word *Eidgenossen*, which signifies confederates, and had been originally the name of that valiant part of the city of *Geneva*, which entered into an alliance with the Swiss Cantons, in order to maintain their liberties against the tyrannical attempts of CHARLES III, duke of *Savoy*. These confederates were called *Eignots*, and from thence, very probably was derived the word *Huguenots* now under consideration. The Count VILLARS in a letter, written to the king of *France*, from the province of *Languedoc*, where he was lieutenant-general, and dated the 11th of November, 1560, calls the riotous Calvinists of the *Cevennes*, *Huguenots*, and this is the first time, that this term is found in the registers of that province, applied to the protestants.]

[e] See the *Histoire Eccles. des Eglises Reformées au Royaume de France*, published at *Antwerp* in three volumes 8^{vo} in the year 1580, and supposed by many to have been written by BEZA. The writers that have given the best accounts of the French Reformed churches, their confession of faith, and their forms of worship and discipline, are enumerated by KOCHERUS, in his *Bibliotheca Theolog. Symbolicæ*, p. 299.

[f] This edict restored and confirmed, in the fullest terms, all the favours that had ever been granted to the protestants by other princes, and particularly by HENRY III. To these privileges others were also added, which had never been granted, nor even demanded, before: such as a free admission to all employments of trust, honour, and profit; the establishing courts and chambers in

CENT. XVI. enjoyment of their civil rights and privileges without persecution or molestation from any quarter [g].

In England and Scotland.

XVI. The church of *Scotland* acknowledges as its founder, JOHN KNOX, the disciple of CALVIN; and, accordingly, from its first reformation, it adopted the doctrine, rites, and form of ecclesiastical government established at *Geneva*. These it has always adhered to with the utmost uniformity, and maintained with the greatest jealousy and zeal; so that even in the last century the designs of those, who attempted to introduce certain changes into its discipline and worship, were publicly opposed by the force of arms [h].

A quite different constitution of things is observable in the church of *England*, which could never be brought to an entire compliance with the ecclesiastical laws of *Geneva*, and which retained, but for a short time, even those which it adopted. It is well known, that the greatest part of those English, who first threw off the yoke of *Rome*, seemed much more inclined to the sentiments of LUTHER concerning the eucharist, the form of public worship, and ecclesiastical government, than to those of the Swiss churches. But the scene changed after the death of HENRY VIII, when, by the industrious zeal of CALVIN, and his disciples, more especially PETER MARTYR, the cause of Lutheranism lost ground considerably; and the universities, schools, and churches became the oracles of Calvinism, which also acquired new votaries among the people from day to day [i]. Hence it happened, that when it was proposed, under the reign of EDWARD VI, to give a fixed and stable form to the doctrine and discipline of the church, *Geneva* was acknowledged as a sister-church; and the theological system, there established by CALVIN, was adopted, and rendered the public rule of faith in *England*. This, however, was done without any change of the form of episcopal government, which had already taken place, and was entirely different from that of *Geneva*; nor was this step attended with any alteration of several religious rites and ceremonies, which were looked upon as superstitious by the greatest part of the Reformed. This difference however, between the two churches, though it appeared at first of little consequence, and, in the judgment even of CALVIN, was esteemed an object of toleration and indulgence, was, nevertheless, in after-ages, a source of many calamities and dissensions, that were highly detrimental both to the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of *Great-Britain*.

The rise of the Puritans.

XVII. The origin of these unhappy dissensions, which it has not as yet been possible entirely to heal, must be sought for in the conduct of those

which the professors of the two religions were equal in number; and the permitting the children of protestants to be educated, without any molestation or constraint, in the public Universities.]

[g] BENOIT, *Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes*, tom. i. lib. v. p. 200.—DANIEL, *Hist. de France*, tom. ix. p. 409.—BOULAY, *Hist. Academ. Paris*. tom. vi.

[h] SALIG. *Hist. Aug. Confession*. part. II. lib. vi. cap. i. p. 403.—[Dr. MOSHEIM alludes, in this passage, to the attempts made, under the reign of CHARLES II, to introduce episcopacy into *Scotland*.]

[i] LOSCHERI *Hist. Motuum*, part. II. lib. iii. cap. vii. p. 67.—SALIG. *Hist. Aug. Confession*. tom. ii. lib. vi. cap. iii. p. 317.

persecuted

persecuted fugitives, who, to save their lives, their families, and their fortunes from the bloody rage, and inhuman tyranny of queen MARY, left the places of their nativity in the year 1554, and took refuge in Germany [k]. Of these fugitive congregations some performed divine worship with the rites that had been authorized by EDWARD VI; while others preferred the Swiss method of worship as more recommendable on account of its purity and simplicity. The former were called *Conformists*, on account of their compliance with the ecclesiastical laws enacted by the prince, now mentioned; and the denominations of *Non-conformists* and *Puritans* were given to the latter, from their insisting upon a form of worship, more exempt from superstition, and of a more pure kind, than the liturgy of EDWARD seemed to them to be. These denominations became permanent marks of distinction, which still continue to denote those different religious communities which divide the British nation. The controversy, concerning the ceremonial part of divine worship, that had divided the exiles abroad, changed scenes, and was removed with them to England; when the auspicious accession of Queen ELIZABETH to the throne permitted them to return to their native country. The hopes of enjoying liberty and of promoting each their respective systems, increased their contests instead of diminishing them; and the breach widened to such a degree, that the most sagacious and provident observers of things, seemed to despair of seeing it healed. The wise queen, in her design to accomplish the reformation of the church, was fully resolved not to confine herself to the model, exhibited by the protestants of Geneva, and their adherents, the *Puritans*; and, therefore, she recommended to the attention and imitation of the doctors, that were employed in this weighty and important matter, the practice and institutions of the primitive ages [l]. When her plan was put in execution, and the

[(k) I cannot help mentioning the uncharitableness of the Lutherans, upon this occasion, who hated these unhappy exiles, because they were *Sacramentarians* (for so the Lutherans called those who denied CHRIST's bodily presence in the eucharist) and expelled from their cities such of the English protestants, as repaired to them, as a refuge from popish superstition and persecution. Such as sought for shelter in France, Geneva, and those parts of Switzerland and Germany, where the Reformation had taken place, and where Lutheranism was not professed, were received with great humanity, and allowed places of public worship. But it was at Frankfort that the exiles were most numerous; and there began the contest and division which gave rise to that separation from the church of England, which continues to this day.]

[(l) Dr. MOSHEIM seems disposed, by this ambiguous expression of the *primitive ages*, to insinuate that Queen ELIZABETH had formed a pure, rational, and evangelical plan of religious discipline and worship. It is however certain, that, instead of being willing to strip religion of the ceremonies, which remained in it, she was rather inclined to bring the public worship still nearer the Romish ritual*, and had a great propensity to several usages in the church of Rome, which were justly looked upon as superstitious. She thanked publicly one of her chaplains who had preached in defence of the *real presence*; she was fond of images, and retained some in her private chapel†; and would undoubtedly have forbid the marriage of the clergy, if CECIL, her secretary, had not interposed‡. Having appointed a committee of divines to review King EDWARD's Liturgy, she gave them an order to strike out all offensive passages against the pope, and to make people easy about the corporal presence of CHRIST in the sacrament§.

* HEYLIN, p. 124.

† Id. *ibid.*

‡ STAYNE's *Life of Parker*, p. 107, 108, 109.

§ NEAL's *Hist. of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 138.

CENT. XVI.

face of the church was changed and reformed by new rules of discipline, and purer forms of public worship, the famous *Act of Uniformity* was issued forth, by which all her subjects were commanded to observe these rules, and to submit to the reformation of the church on the footing on which it was now placed by the queen, as its supreme, visible head upon earth. The *Puritans* refused their assent to these proceedings: pleaded the dictates of their consciences in behalf of this refusal, and complained heavily, that the gross superstitions of popery, which they had looked upon as abrogated and abolished were now revived, and even imposed by authority. They were not, indeed, all equally exasperated against the new constitution of the church; nor did they, in effect, carry their opposition to equal degrees of excess. The more violent demanded the total abrogation of all that had been done towards the establishment of a national religion, and required nothing less than that the church of *England* should be exactly modelled after that of *Geneva*. The milder and more moderate *Puritans* were much more equitable in their demands, and only desired liberty of conscience with the privilege of celebrating divine worship in their own way. The queen did not judge it proper to grant to either the object of their requests, but rather intent upon the suppression of this troublesome sect (as she was used to call it) permitted its enemies to employ for that purpose all the resources of artifice, and all the severity of the laws. Thus was that form of religion established in *Britain*, which separated the English equally from the church of *Rome* on the one hand, and from the other churches which had renounced popery, on the other, but which, at the same time, laid a perpetual foundation for dissension and feuds, in that, otherwise, happy and prosperous nation [m].

The sentiments
and doctrine of
the Puritans.

XVIII. The incident, that gave rise to these unhappy divisions, which were productive of so many and such dreadful calamities, was a matter of very small moment, and which did not seem to affect, in any way, the interests of true religion and virtue. The chief leaders among the *Puritans* entertained a strong aversion to the vestments, worn by the English clergy in the celebration of divine worship. As these habits had been made use of in the times of popery, and seemed to renew the impressions that had been made upon the people by the Romish priests, they appeared to the *Puritans* in no other light, than as the *ensigns of Antichrist*. The spirit of opposition, being once set on foot, proceeded, in its remonstrances, to matters of

[m] No writer has treated this part of the Ecclesiastical History of *Britain* in a more ample and elegant manner than DANIEL NEAL, in his *History of the Puritans or Protestant Non-conformists*, in four volumes in 8°. The first part of this laborious work was published at *London*, in the year 1732, and the latter part in 1738. The author, who was himself a *Non-conformist*, has not indeed been able to impose silence so far on the warm and impetuous spirit of party, as not to discover a certain degree of partiality in favour of his brethren. For while he relates, in the most circumstantial manner, all the injuries, the *Puritans* received from the bishops, and those of the established religion, he, in many places, diminishes, excuses, or suppresses the faults and failings of these separatists. See also for an account of the religious history of these times, STRYPE's *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury* under Queen ELIZABETH, viz. PARKER, GRINDAL, and WHITGIFT. superior

superior moment. The form of ecclesiastical government, established in *England*, was one of the first and main grievances of which the Puritans complained. They looked upon this form as quite different from that which had been instituted by CHRIST, the great lawgiver of the church; and, in conformity with the sentiments of CALVIN, maintained, that, by the divine law, all the ministers of the gospel were absolutely equal in point of rank and authority. They did not indeed, think it unlawful, that a person, distinguished by the title of a *bishop*, or *superintendent*, should preside in the assembly of the clergy, for the sake of maintaining order and decency in their method of proceeding; but they thought it incongruous and absurd, that the persons invested with this character should be ranked, as the bishops had hitherto been, among the nobility of the kingdom, employed in civil and political affairs, and distinguished so eminently by their worldly opulence and power. This controversy was not carried on, however, with excessive animosity and zeal, as long as the English bishops pretended to derive their dignity and authority from no other source, than the laws of their country, and pleaded a right, purely human, to the rank they held in church and state. But the flame broke out with redoubled fury in the year 1588, when BANCROFT, afterwards archbishop of *Canterbury*, ventured to assert that the order of bishops was superior to the body of presbyters, not in consequence of any human institution, but by the express appointment of God himself [n]. This doctrine was readily adopted by many, and the consequences, that seemed naturally to flow from it in favour of episcopal ordination, happened in effect, and gave new fuel to the flame of controversy. For they, who embraced the sentiments of BANCROFT, considered all ministers of the Gospel who had not received ordination from a bishop, as irregularly invested with the sacred character; and also maintained, that the clergy, in those countries where there were no bishops, were destitute of the gifts and qualifications that were necessary to the exercise of the pastoral office, and were to be looked upon as inferior to the Roman-catholic priests.

XIX. All these things exasperated the *Puritans*, whose complaints, however, were not confined to the objects already mentioned. There were many circumstances that entered into their plan of reformation. They had a singular antipathy against *cathedral* churches, and demanded the abolition of the *archdeacons*, *deans*, *canons*, and other *officials* that are supported by their lands and revenues. They disapproved of the pompous manner of worship that is generally observed in these churches, and looked, particularly, upon instrumental music, as improperly employed in the service of God. The severity of their zeal was also very great, for they were of opinion, that, not

[n] See STRYPE's *Life and Acts of John Whitgift*, archbishop of *Canterbury*, p. 121. [The first English Reformers admitted but two orders of church-officers to be of *divine appointment*, viz. *bishops* and *deacons*, a presbyter and a bishop, according to them, being but two names for the same office; but Dr. BANCROFT, in a sermon, preached at *Paul's Cross* January 12, 1588, maintained, that the bishops of *England* were a distinct order from *priests*, and had superiority over them *jure divino*.]

CENT. XVI. open profligates, but even persons, whose piety was dubious, deserved to be excluded from the communion of the church [o]; and they endeavoured to justify the rigour of this decision by observing that the church, being the congregation of the faithful, nothing was more incumbent on its ministers and rulers, than to watch against its being defiled by the presence of persons destitute of true faith and piety. They found, moreover, much subject of affliction and complaint in the rites and ceremonies that were imposed by the order of the Queen, and the authority of her council [p]; among these were the *festivals* or *holidays* that were celebrated in honour of the saints, the use of the *sign of the cross* more especially in the sacrament of baptism, the nominating godfathers and godmothers as sureties for the education of children whose parents were still living [q], and the doctrine relating to the validity of lay-baptism [r]. They disliked the reading of

[(o) The Puritans justified themselves in relation to this point in a letter addressed, from their prison, to Queen ELIZABETH in the year 1592, by observing, that their sentiments concerning the persons subject to excommunication, and also concerning the effects and extent of that act of church-discipline, were conformable to those of all the Reformed churches, and to the doctrine and practice of the church of England in particular. They declared, more especially, that, according to their sense of things, the censure of excommunication deprived only of spiritual privileges and comforts, without taking away either liberty, goods, lands, government private or public, or any other civil or earthly commodity of this life; and thus they distinguished themselves from those furious and fanatical anabaptists, who had committed such disorders in Germany, and some of whom were now making a noise in England.]

[(p) By this council our author means the *High Commission Court*, of which it is proper to give here some account, as its proceedings essentially belong to the Ecclesiastical History of England. This court took its rise from a remarkable clause in the act of supremacy, by which the queen and her successors were empowered to choose persons "to exercise, under her, all manner of jurisdiction, privileges, and pre-eminences, touching any spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the realms of England and Ireland, as also to visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend all errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, contempts, offences, enormities whatsoever. Provided, that they have no power to determine any thing to be heresy, but what has been adjudged to be so by the authority of the canonical scripture, or by the first four general councils, or any of them; or by any other general council, wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of canonical scripture, or such as shall hereafter be declared to be heresy by the High Court of Parliament, with the assent of the clergy in convocation."—Upon the authority of this clause the queen appointed a certain number of commissioners for ecclesiastical causes, who, in many instances, abused their power. The court, they composed, was called the *Court of High Commission*, because it claimed a more extensive jurisdiction and higher powers, than the ordinary Courts of the Bishops. Its jurisdiction reached over the whole kingdom, and was much the same with that which had been lodged in the single person of Lord CROMWELL, vicar general to HENRY VIII. These commissioners were empowered to make enquiry, not only by the legal methods of juries and witnesses, but by all other ways and means which they could devise, that is, by rack, torture, inquisition, and imprisonment. They were vested with a Right to examine such persons as they suspected by administering to them an oath (not allowed of in their commission, and therefore called *ex officio*) by which they were obliged to answer all questions, and thereby be obliged to accuse themselves, or their most intimate friends. The fines they imposed were merely discretionary; the imprisonment to which they condemned was limited by no rule but their own pleasure; they imposed, when they thought proper, new articles of faith on the clergy, and practised all the iniquities and cruelties of a real *Inquisition*. See RAPIN's and HUME's Histories of England, under the reign of ELIZABETH, and NEAL's History of the Puritans, passim.]

[(q) Other rites and customs displeasing to the Puritans, and omitted by our author, were, kneeling at the sacrament of the Lord's supper, bowing at the name of Jesus, giving the ring in marriage, the prohibition of marriage during certain times of the year, and the licensing it for money, as also the confirmation of children by episcopal imposition of hands.]

[(r) The words of the original are, *nec sacris Christianis pueros recens natos ab aliis, quam sacerdo-*
the

the *apocryphal* books in the church; and, with respect to set forms of prayer, CENT. XVI. although they did not go so far as to insist upon their being entirely abolished, yet they pleaded for a right to every minister, of modifying, correcting, and using them in such a manner, as might tend most to the advancement of true piety, and of addressing the Deity in such terms as were suggested by their inward feelings, instead of those that were dictated by others. In a word, they were of opinion, that the government and discipline of the church of *England* ought to have been modelled after the ecclesiastical laws and institutions of *Geneva*, and that no indulgence was to be shewn to those ceremonies or practices, which bore the smallest resemblance of the discipline or worship of the church of *Rome*.

XX. These sentiments, considered in themselves, seemed neither susceptible of a satisfactory defence, nor of a compleat refutation. Their solidity or falshood depended upon the principles from whence they were derived; and no regular controversy could be carried on upon these matters, until the contending parties adopted some common and evident principles, by which they might corroborate their respective systems. It is only by an examination of these, that it can be known on what side truth lies, and what degree of utility or importance can be attributed to a contest of this nature. The principles laid down by the *Queen's commissioners* on the one hand, and the *Puritans* on the other, were indeed very different.

The principles on which the Puritans maintained their sentiments concerning ecclesiastical government and divine worship.

For in the *first place*, The former maintained, that the right of reformation, that is, the privilege of removing the corruptions and of correcting the errors, that may have been introduced into the doctrine, discipline, or worship of the church is lodged in the sovereign, or civil magistrate alone; while the latter denied, that the power of the magistrate extended so far, and maintained, that it was rather the business of the clergy to restore religion to its native dignity and lustre. This was the opinion of CALVIN, as has been already observed.

Secondly, The *Queen's commissioners* maintained, that the rule of proceeding, in reforming the doctrine or discipline of the church, was not to be derived from the sacred writings *alone*, but also from the writings and decisions of the fathers in the primitive ages. The *Puritans*, on the contrary, affirmed, that the inspired word of God being the pure and *only* fountain of wisdom and truth, it was from thence *alone* that the rules and directions were to be drawn, which were to guide the measures of those, who undertook to purify the faith, or to rectify the discipline and worship of the church;

tibus, initiari patiebantur. The Roman-catholics, who look upon the external rite of baptism as *absolutely necessary* to salvation, allow, consequently, of its being performed by a layman, or a midwife, where a clergyman is not at hand, nay (if such a ridiculous thing may be mentioned) by a surgeon, where a still birth is apprehended. The church of *England*, though it teacheth in general, that none ought to baptize, but men dedicated to the service of God, yet doth not esteem null, baptism performed by laicks or women, because it makes a difference between what is *essential* to a sacrament, and what is requisite in the *regular* way of using it. The Puritans, that they might neither prescribe nor even connive at a practice that seemed to be founded on the absolute necessity of infant baptism, would allow that sacred rite to be performed by the clergy alone.]

CENT. XVI. and that the ecclesiastical institutions of the early ages, as also the writings of the ancient doctors, were absolutely destitute of all sort of authority.

Thirdly, The Queen's commissioners ventured to assert, that the church of Rome was a true church, though corrupt and erroneous in many points of doctrine and government; that the Roman pontif, though chargeable with temerity and arrogance in assuming to himself the title and jurisdiction of head of the whole church, was, nevertheless, to be esteemed a true and lawful bishop; and, consequently, that the ministers, ordained by him, were qualified for performing the pastoral duties. This was a point, which the English bishops thought it absolutely necessary to maintain, since they could not otherwise claim the honour of deriving their dignities, in an uninterrupted line of succession, from the apostles. But the *Puritans* entertained very different notions of this matter; they considered the Romish hierarchy, as a system of political and spiritual tyranny that had justly forfeited the title and privileges of a true church; they looked upon its pontif as *Antichrist*, and its discipline as vain, superstitious, idolatrous and diametrically opposite to the injunctions of the gospel; and in consequence of this, they renounced its communion, and regarded all approaches to its discipline and worship, as highly dangerous to the cause of true religion.

Fourthly, The court commissioners considered as the best and most perfect form of ecclesiastical government, that, which took place during the first four or five centuries; they even preferred it to that, which had been instituted by the apostles, because, as they alledged, our Saviour, and his apostles had accommodated the Form, mentioned in Scripture, to the feeble and infant state of the church, and left it to the wisdom and discretion of future ages to modify it in such a manner as might be suitable to the triumphant progress of Christianity, the grandeur of a national establishment, and also to the ends of civil policy. The *Puritans* asserted, in opposition to this, that the rules of church government were clearly laid down in the Holy Scriptures, the only standard of spiritual discipline [s]; and that the apostles, in establishing the first Christian church on the Aristocratical plan that was then observed in the constitution of the Jewish Sanhedrim, designed it as an unchangeable model to be followed in all times and in all places.

Lastly, The court reformers were of opinion, that things *indifferent*, which are neither commanded nor forbidden by the authority of Scripture, such as the external rites of public worship, the kind of vestments that are to be used by the clergy, religious festivals, and the like, might be ordered, determined, and rendered a matter of obligation by the authority of the civil magistrate; and that, in such a case, the violation of his commands would be

[(s) By this they meant at least, that nothing should be imposed as necessary, but what was expressly contained in the Holy Scriptures, or deduced from them by necessary consequence. They maintained, still farther, that supposing it proved, that all things necessary to the good government of the church could not be deduced from Holy Scripture, yet, that the discretionary power of supplying this defect was not vested in the civil magistrate, but in the spiritual officers of the church.]

no less criminal, than an act of rebellion against the laws of the state. The CENT. XVI. *Puritans* alledged, in answer to this assertion, that it was an indecent prostitution of power to impose as *necessary* and *indispensable*, those things which CHRIST had left in the class of matters *indifferent*; since this was a manifest incroachment upon that *liberty, with which* the Divine Saviour *had made us free*. To this they added, that such rites and ceremonies, as had been abused to idolatrous purposes, and had a manifest tendency to revive the impressions of superstition and popery in the minds of men, could, by no means, be considered as *indifferent*, but deserved to be rejected without hesitation, as impious and profane. Such, in their estimation, were the religious ceremonies of ancient times, whose abrogation was refused by the Queen and her council [t].

XXI. This contest between the commissioners of the court, and their opponents, who desired a more compleat reformation than had yet taken place, would have been much more dangerous in its consequences, had that party, that was distinguished by the general denomination of *Puritans*, been united in their sentiments, views, and measures. But the case was quite otherwise. For this large body, composed of persons of different ranks, characters, opinions, and intentions, and unanimous in nothing but their antipathy against the forms of doctrine and discipline, that were established by law, was, all of a sudden, divided into a variety of sects; of which some spread abroad the delusions of enthusiasm, which had turned their own brains; while others displayed their folly in inventing new and whimsical plans of church-government. The most famous of all these sects was that which was formed, about the year 1581, by ROBERT BROWN, an insinuating man, but very unsettled and inconsistent in his views and notions of things. This innovator did not differ, in point of doctrine, either from the church of *England* or from the rest of the *Puritans*; but he had formed new and singular notions concerning the nature of the church, and the rules of ecclesiastical government. He was for dividing the whole body of the faithful into separate societies or congregations, not larger than those which were formed by the apostles in the infancy of Christianity; and maintained, that such a number of persons, as could be contained in an ordinary place of worship, ought to be considered as a *church*, and enjoy all the rights and privileges that are competent to an ecclesiastical community. These small societies he pronounced *independent jure divino*, and entirely exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishops, in whose hands the court placed the reins of spiritual government; and also from

The Brownists,
a sect of the
Puritans.

[(t) Dr. MOSHEIM, in these five articles, has followed the account of this controversy given by Mr. NEAL, in his *History of the Puritans*. This latter adds a sixth article, not of debate, but of union, "Both parties (says he) agreed *too well* in asserting the necessity of an uniformity of public worship, and of calling in the sword of the magistrate for the support and defence of their several principles, which they made an ill use of in their turns, as they could grasp the power into their hands. The standard of uniformity, according to the bishops, was the *queen's supremacy*, and *the laws of the land*; according to the *Puritans*, the *decrees of provincial and national synods* allowed and enforced by the civil magistrate: But neither party were for admitting that liberty of conscience, and freedom of profession, which is every man's right as far as "is consistent with the peace of the government under which he lives."]

CENT. XVI. that of *synods*, which the Puritans regarded as the supreme visible sources of ecclesiastical authority. He also maintained, that the power of governing each congregation, and providing for its welfare, resided in the people; and that each member had an equal share in this direction, and an equal right to order matters for the good of the 'whole society [u]. Hence all points both of doctrine and discipline were submitted to the discussion of the whole congregation, and whatever was supported by a majority of votes passed into a law. It was the congregation also that elected certain of the brethren to the office of pastors to perform the duty of public instruction, and the several branches of divine worship, reserving, however, to themselves the power of dismissing these ministers, and reducing them to the condition of private members, whenever they should think such a change conducive to the spiritual advantage of the community. For these pastors were not esteemed superior, either in sanctity or rank, to the rest of their brethren, nor distinguished from them by any other circumstance, than the liberty of preaching and praying, which they derived from the free will and consent of the congregation. It is, besides, to be observed, that their right of preaching was, by no means, of an exclusive nature, or peculiar to them alone; since any member, that thought proper to exhort or instruct the Brethren, was abundantly indulged in the liberty of *prophesying* to the whole assembly. Accordingly, when the ordinary teacher or pastor had finished his discourse, all the other Brethren were permitted to communicate in public their sentiments and illustrations upon any useful or edifying subject, on which they supposed they could throw new light. In a word, BROWN aimed at nothing less than modelling the form of the church after that infant community, that was founded by the apostles, without once considering the important changes both in the religious and civil state of the world since that time, the influence that these changes must necessarily have upon all ecclesiastical establishments, and the particular circumstances of the Christian church in consequence of its former corruptions and its late reformation. And, if his notions were crude and chimerical, the zeal with which he, and his associates maintained and propagated them was intemperate and extravagant in the highest degree. For he affirmed, that all communion was to be broken off with those religious societies, that were founded upon a different plan from his, and treated, more especially, the church of *England* as a spurious church, whose ministers were unlawfully ordained, whose discipline was popish and antichristian, and whose sacraments and institutions were destitute of all efficacy and virtue. The sect of this hot-headed innovator, not being able to endure the severe treatment

[(u) It is farther to be observed, that one church was not entitled to exercise jurisdiction over another; but each might give the other counsel or admonition, if they walked in a disorderly manner, or abandoned the capital truths of religion; and if the offending church did not receive the admonition, the others were to withdraw, and publicly disown them as a church of CHRIST. On the other hand, the powers of their church-officers were confined within the narrow limits of their own society. The pastor of a church might not administer the sacrament of baptism or the Lord's supper to any but those of his own communion.]

which

which their opposition to the established forms of religious government and worship had drawn upon them from an administration (that was not distinguished by its mildness and indulgence [w]) retired into the Netherlands, and founded churches at *Middleburg* in *Zealand*, and at *Amsterdam* and *Leyden* in the Province of *Holland*; but their establishments were neither solid nor durable [x]. Their founder returned into *England*, and, having renounced his principles of separation, took orders in the established church and obtained a benefice [y]. The Puritan exiles, whom he thus abandoned, disagreed among themselves, were split into parties, and their affairs declined from day to day [z]. This engaged the wiser part of them to mitigate the severity of their founder's plan, and to soften the rigour of his uncharitable decisions; and hence arose the community of the *Independants*, or *Congregational Brethren*, which still subsists, and of which an account shall be given in the history of the following century.

XXII. In the Belgic provinces, the friends of the reformation seemed for a long time uncertain, whether they should embrace the communion of the Swiss, or of the Lutheran, church. Each of these had zealous friends and powerful patrons [a]. The matter was, nevertheless, decided in the year 1571, and the religious system of CALVIN was publicly adopted. For the Belgic confession of faith, which then appeared [b], was drawn up in the spirit and almost in the terms of that which was received in the Reformed churches in *France*, and differed considerably, in several respects, from the confession of *Augsburg*, but more especially in the article relating to CHRIST's presence in the eucharist [c]. This will not appear surprising to those who consider the vicinity of the French to the Low-Countries; the number of French protestants that were constantly passing or sojourning there; the extraordinary reputation of CALVIN, and of the academy of *Geneva*; as also the indefatigable zeal of his disciples in extending the limits of their church, and propagating, throughout all *Europe*, their system of doctrine, discipline, and government. Be that as it may, from this period the Dutch, who had before been denominated *Lutherans*, assumed universally the title of Re-

The state of the
Reformed church
in the Nether-
lands,

[w] This parenthesis is added by the translator, and is but too much verified by the history of the religious troubles in *England*.]

[x] The British churches at *Amsterdam* and *Middleburg* are incorporated into the national Dutch church, and their pastors are members of the Dutch synod, which is sufficient to shew that there are at this time no traces of *Brownism* or *independency* in these churches. The church at *Leyden*, where ROBINSON had fixed the standard of *independency* about the year 1595, was dispersed; and it is very remarkable, that a part of this church, transplanting themselves into *America*, laid the foundation of the colony of *New-England*.]

[y] BROWN, in his new preferment, forgot not only the rigour of his principles, but also the gravity of his former morals; for he led a very idle and dissolute life. See NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 376.]

[z] NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, vol. i. chap. vi.—HOORNBECKII *Summa Controvers.* lib. x. p. 738.—FULLER'S *Ecclesiastical History of Britain*, book X. p. 168.

[a] LOSCHERI *Histor. Motuum*, part. III. lib. v. cap. iv. p. 74.

[b] KOCHERI *Biblioth. Theolog. Symbolicæ*, p. 216.

[c] See BRANDT'S *History of the Reformation of the Netherlands*, (written in Dutch) vol. i. book V. p. 253.

formed,

CENT. XVI *formed*, in which also they imitated the French, by whom this title had been first invented and adopted. It is true indeed, that as long as they were subjected to the Spanish yoke, the fear of exposing themselves to the displeasure of their sovereign induced them to avoid the title of *Reformed*, and to call themselves *Associates of the Brethren of the Confession of Augsburg*. For the Lutherans were esteemed, by the Spanish court, much better subjects than the disciples of CALVIN, who, on account of the tumults that had lately prevailed in *France*, were supposed to have a greater propensity to mutiny and sedition [d].

and in Poland.

XXIII. The light of the reformation was first brought from *Saxony* into *Poland* by the disciples of LUTHER. Some time after this happy period the *Bohemian Brethren*, whom the Romish clergy had expelled from their country, as also several Helvetic doctors propagated their sentiments among the Poles. Some congregations were also founded in that Republic by the *Anabaptists*, *Anti-Trinitarians*, and other sectaries [e]. Hence it was, that three distinct communities, each of which adopted the main principles of the reformation, were to be found in *Poland*, viz. the *Bohemian Brethren*, the *Lutherans*, and *Swiss*. These communities, in order to defend themselves with the greater vigour against their common enemies, formed, among themselves, a kind of confederacy, in a synod held at *Sendomir* in the year 1570, upon certain conditions, which were comprehended in the *Confession of Faith*, that derives its title from the city now mentioned [f]. But as this association seemed rather adapted to accelerate the conclusion of a peace, than to promote the cause of truth, the points in debate between the *Lutherans* and the *Reformed* being expressed in this reconciling confession in vague and ambiguous terms, it was soon after this warmly opposed by many of the former, and was entirely annulled in the following century. Many attempts have, indeed, been made to revive it, but they have not answered the expectations of those who have employed their dexterity and zeal in this matter. In *Prussia* the *Reformed* gained ground after the death of LUTHER and MELANCTHON, and founded the flourishing churches that still subsist in that country [g].

The Bohemian Brethren.

XXIV. The *Bohemian*, or, as they are otherwise called, the *Moravian Brethren*, who descended from the better sort of Hussites, and were distinguished by several religious institutions of a singular nature, and well adapted to guard their community against the reigning vices and corruptions

[(d) Dr. MOSHEIM advances this on the authority of a passage in BRANDT's *History of the Reformation of the Netherlands*, (p. 254, 255.) which is written in Dutch, and is, indeed, a most curious and valuable work, notwithstanding the author's propensity to favour the cause of Arminianism, of which he was one of the most respectable patrons.]

[e] LOSCHER *Hist. Motuum*, part. III. lib. v. cap. iii. p. 36.—SALIG. *Hist. Aug. Confession*. tom. ii. lib. vi. cap. iii, iv, v. p. 516.—REGENVOLSCII *Hist. Eccles. Slavonicar.* lib. i. cap. xvi. p. 71.—SALIGNAC, *Hist. de Pologne*, tom. v. p. 40.—KAUTZ, *Præcipua Relig. Evangel. in Polonia Fata*, published in 4^{to} at Hamburg in the year 1738.

[f] See DAN. ERNEST. JABLONSKY, *Historia Consensus Sendomirensis*, published at Berlin in 4^{to} in the year 1731; as also the *Epistola Apologetica*, of the same author, in defence of the work, now mentioned, against the objections of an anonymous author.

[g] LOSCHER *Historia Motuum*, part. III. lib. vi. cap. i. p. 216.

of the times, had no sooner heard of LUTHER's design of reforming the church, than they sent deputies, in the year 1522, to recommend themselves to his friendship and good offices. In succeeding times, they continued to discover the same zealous attachment to the Lutheran churches in Saxony, and also to those, that were founded in other countries. These offers could not be well accepted without a previous examination of their religious sentiments and principles. And, indeed, this examination turned to their advantage; for neither LUTHER nor his disciples found any thing, either in their doctrine or discipline, that was, in any great measure, liable to censure; and, though he could not approve, in every particular, of their *Confession of Faith*, which they submitted to his judgment, yet he looked upon it as an object of toleration and indulgence [b]. Nevertheless, the death of LUTHER, and the expulsion of these *Brethren* from their country in the year 1547, gave a new turn to their religious connexions; and great numbers of them, more especially of those who retired into Poland, embraced the religious sentiments and discipline of the *Reformed*. The attachment of the Bohemians to the *Lutherans* seemed, indeed, to be revived by the *Convention of Sendomir* already mentioned; but as the articles of union, that were drawn up in that assembly, lost all their force and authority in a little time, the Bohemians, by degrees, entered one and all into the communion of the Swiss church [i]. This union was, at first, formed on the express condition, that the two churches should continue to be governed by their respective laws and institutions, and should have separate places of public worship; but, in the following century, all remains of dissension were removed in the synods held at *Astrog* in the years 1620 and 1627, and the two congregations were formed into one under the title of *The Church of the United Brethren*. In this coalition the reconciled parties shewed to each other reciprocal marks of toleration and indulgence; for the external form of the church was modelled after the discipline of the *Bohemian Brethren*, and the articles of faith were taken from the creed of the *Calvinists* [k].

XXV. The descendants of the *Waldenses*, who lived shut up in the valleys of *Piedmont*, were naturally led, by their situation in the neighbourhood of the French, and of the Republic of *Geneva*, to embrace the doctrines and rites of the *Reformed* church. So far down, however, as the year 1630, they retained a considerable part of their ancient discipline and tenets; but the plague, that broke out that year, having destroyed the greatest part of this unhappy people, and among the rest a considerable number of their pastors and clergy, they addressed themselves to the French churches for spiritual succour; and the new doctors, sent from thence, made several changes in

The Waldenses,
Hungarians, and
Transylvanians.

[b] See a German work of CARPZOVIVS, entitled, *Nachricht von den Bohmischen Brudern*, p. 46. as also JO. CHR. KOCHER *Bibliotheca Theologiae Symbolica*, p. 76.

[i] Besides COMENIUS, CAMERARIUS, and LASITIUS, who have written professedly the History of the Bohemian Brethren, see LOSCHER *Historia Motuum*, part. III. lib. v. cap. vi. p. 99.—SALIG. *Hist. Confession. Aug.* tom. ii. lib. vi. cap. iii. p. 520.—AD. REGENVOLSCI *Hist. Eccles. Slavonicae*, lib. i. cap. xiii, xiv, xv.

[k] REGENVOLSCIUS, *loc. citat.* lib. i. cap. xiv. p. 120.

CENT. XVI. the discipline and doctrine of the Waldenses, and rendered them conformable, in every respect, with those of the protestant churches in France [l].

The Hungarians and Transylvanians were engaged to renounce the errors and superstitions of the church of Rome by the writings of LUTHER, and the ministry of his disciples. But some time after, MATTHIAS DEWAY and other doctors began to introduce, in a secret manner, among these nations the doctrines of the Swiss churches in relation to the eucharist, as also their principles of ecclesiastical government. This doctrine and these principles were propagated in a more open and public manner, towards the year 1550, by SZEGEDIN and other Calvinist teachers, whose ministry was attended with remarkable success. This change was followed by the same dissensions, that had broke out in other countries on like occasions; and these dissensions grew into an open schism among the friends of the reformation in these provinces, which the lapse of time has rather confirmed than diminished [m].

Of the Lutheran churches that embraced Calvinism.

XXVI. After the solemn publication of the famous *Form of Concord*, of which an account has been already given, many German churches, of the Lutheran communion, dissolved their original bonds, and embraced the doctrine and discipline of CALVIN. Among these we may place the churches of Nassau, Hanau, and Isenburg, with several others of less note. In the year 1595, the princes of Anhalt, influenced by the counsels of WOLFGANG AMLINGIUS, renounced also the profession of Lutheranism, and introduced into their dominions the religious tenets and rites of Geneva; this revolution, however, produced a long and warm controversy between the Lutherans and the inhabitants of this principality [n]. The doctrines of the Calvinist or Reformed church, more especially those that relate to the eucharist, were also introduced into Denmark, towards the conclusion of this century; for in this kingdom the disciples and votaries of MELANCTHON, who had always discovered a strong propensity to a union between the protestant churches, were extremely numerous, and they had at their head NICHOLAS HEMMINGIUS, a man eminent for his piety and learning. But the views of this divine, and the schemes of his party, being discovered much sooner than they expected by the vigilant defenders of the Lutheran cause, their plans were

[l] LEGER, *Histoire Generale des Eglises Vaudoises*, livr. i. chap. xxxiii. p. 205, 206.—ABR. SCULTETI *Annales Renovati Evangelii*, p. 294.—DAN. GERDES *Hist. Renovati Evangelii*, tom. ii. p. 401.

[m] PAULI DEBREZENI *Historia Eccles. Reform. in Hungar. et Transylvan.* lib. ii. p. 64. 72. 98.—*Unschuld. Nachricht*. A. 1738, p. 1076.—GEORG. HANERI *Historia Eccles. Transylv.* published at Francfort in 12^{mo} in the year 1694.

[n] See for an account of this matter the German work of BECHMAN, which is thus entitled, *Histoire des Hauses Anhalt*, vol. ii. p. 133. and that of KRAFT, which bears the title of *Ausführliche Historie von dem Exorcismo*, p. 428. 497. [Though the princes professed Calvinism, and introduced Calvinist ministers into all the churches, where they had the right of patronage, yet the people were left free in their choice; and the noblemen and their vassals that were attached to Lutheranism had secured to them the unrestrained exercise of their religion. By virtue of a convention made in 1679, the Lutherans were permitted to erect new churches. The Zerbst line, with the greatest part of its subjects, profess Lutheranism; but the three other lines, with their respective territories, are Calvinists.]

disconcerted

disconcerted [o], and the progress of Calvinism was successfully opposed by CENT. XVI. the Lutheran ministers, seconded by the countenance and authority of the sovereign [p].

XXVII. It must not however be imagined, that the different nations, that embraced the communion of the Calvinist church, adopted, at the same time, without exception, all its tenets, rites, and institutions. This universal conformity was, indeed, ardently desired by the Helvetic doctors; but their desires, in this respect, were far from being accomplished. The English, as is sufficiently known, rejected the forms of ecclesiastical government and religious worship that were adopted by the other Reformed churches, and could not be persuaded to receive, as public and national articles of faith, the doctrines that were propagated in *Switzerland* in relation to the sacrament of the Lord's supper and the Divine decrees [q]. The protestants in *Holland, Bremen, Poland, Hungary*, and the Palatinate, followed, indeed, the French and Helvetic churches in their sentiments concerning the eucharist, in the simplicity of their worship and in their principles of ecclesiastical polity; but not in their notions of *predestination*, which intricate doctrine they left undefined and submitted to the free examination and private judgment of every individual [r]. It may farther be affirmed, that before the synod of *Dort* [s], no Reformed church had obliged its members by any special law, or article of faith, to adhere to the doctrine of the church of *Geneva* relating to primary causes of the salvation of the elect or the ruin

The diversity that reigned among the various branches of the Reformed church.

[o] ERICI PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Ecclesiae Danicae Diplomatici*, tom. iii. p. 57.

[p] That is (for our author consistently with truth can mean no more) the designs, that were formed to render *Calvinism*, the national and established religion, proved abortive. It is certain however, that Calvinism made a very considerable progress in *Denmark*, and has still a great number of votaries in that kingdom.]

[q] It is true indeed, that the doctrine of ZUINGLE, who represented the bread and wine as nothing more than external signs of the death of CHRIST, was not adopted by the church of *England*; but the doctrine of CALVIN was embraced by that church, and is plainly taught in the XXVIIIth article of its faith. As to what relates to the doctrine of the Divine Decrees, Dr. MOSHEIM is equally mistaken. The XVIIth article of the church of *England*, is, as Bishop BURNET candidly acknowledges, framed according to St. AUGUSTIN's doctrine, which scarcely differs at all from that of CALVIN; and, though it be expressed with a certain latitude that renders it susceptible of a mitigated interpretation, yet it is very probable, that those who penned it were patrons of the doctrine of Absolute Decrees. The very cautions, that are subjoined to this article, intimate that *Calvinism* was what it was meant to establish. It is certain, that the calvinistical doctrine of predestination prevailed among the first English Reformers, the greatest part of whom were, at least, *Sublapsarians*; in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH it was predominant; but after that period it lost ground imperceptibly, and was renounced by the church of *England* in the reign of King CHARLES I. Some members of that church still adhered, nevertheless, to the tenets of CALVIN, and maintained, not only that the thirty-nine articles were calvinistical, but also affirmed, that they were not susceptible of being interpreted in that latitude for which the *Arminians* contended. These episcopal votaries of Calvinism were called *Doctrinal Puritans*. See BURNET's *Exposition of the Seventeenth Article*, &c. and NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 579.]

[r] See GROTII *Apologet. eorum, qui Hollandiae ante mutationem*, A. 1618, *præfuerunt*, cap. iii. p. 54. Ed. Paris. 1640, in 12^{mo}.

[s] It was in this famous synod, that was assembled in the year 1618, and of which we shall have occasion to give a more ample account in the history of the following century, that the doctrine of CALVIN was fixed as the national and established religion of the Seven United Provinces.]

CENT. XVI. of the reprobate. It is true indeed, that in the places now mentioned the greatest part of the *Reformed* doctors fell, by degrees, of their own accord into the Calvinistical opinion concerning these intricate points; and this was principally owing, no doubt, to the great reputation of the academy of *Geneva*, which was generally frequented, in this century, by those among the *Reformed* who were candidates for the ministry.

The doctrine adopted by the Reformed churches.

XXVIII. The books of the Old and New Testament are regarded by the *Reformed* churches as the only sources of Divine Truth; it must however be observed, that, to their authority, the church of *England* adds that of the writings of the Fathers during the first five centuries [t]. The *Reformed* and the *Lutherans* agree in maintaining, that the Holy Scriptures are infallible in all things; that, in matters, of which the knowledge is necessary to salvation, they are clear, full, and compleat; and also that they are to be explained by themselves, and not either by the dictates of human reason, or the decisions of the ancient Fathers. Several of the doctors among the former have indeed employed too freely the sagacity of their natural understanding in explaining those divine mysteries that are contained in the Gospel; and this circumstance has induced many to imagine, that the *Reformed* adopted two sources of religion, two criterions of divine truth, viz. the *Holy Scripture*, and *Human Reason*. But perhaps it will be found, that, in this respect, doctors of both communions have sometimes gone too far, being led on by the spirit of controversy, and animated with the desire of victory. For, if we except the singular tenets of some individuals, it may be affirmed with truth, that the *Lutherans* and the *Reformed* are unanimous in the matter now under consideration. They both maintain, that *contradictory propositions cannot be the objects of faith*; and consequently, that all *doctrines* that contain *ideas* and *notions*, that are *repugnant to*, and *mutually destroy each other*, must be *false* and *incredible*. It is true indeed, that the *Reformed* some times use this principle in a contentious manner, to overturn certain points of the *Lutheran* system which they have thought proper to reject [u].

The points in which the Reformed and Lutherans disagree.

XXIX. The *Reformed*, if by this denomination we understand those who embrace the sentiments of CALVIN, differ entirely from the *Lutherans* in the following points:

[(t) There is nothing in the thirty-nine articles of the church of *England*, which implies its considering the writings of the Fathers of the first five centuries, as an authoritative criterion of religious truth. There is, indeed, a clause in the *Act of Uniformity*, passed in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH, declaring, that her delegates, in ecclesiastical matters, should not determine any thing to be heresy, but what was adjudged so by the authority of Scripture, or by the first four general councils; and this has perhaps misled Dr. MOSHEIM in the passage to which this note refers. Much respect indeed, and perhaps too much has been paid to the Fathers; but that has been always a matter of choice, and not of obligation.]

[(u) Our author has here undoubtedly in view the *Lutheran* doctrine of *Consubstantiation*, which supposes the same *extended body* to be *totally* present in different places, at one and the same time. To call this a gross and glaring contradiction, seems rather the dictate of common sense, than the suggestion of a contentious spirit.]

1st, In their notions of the sacrament of the Lord's supper. The *Lutherans* affirm, that the body and blood of CHRIST are *materially present* in this sacrament, though in an incomprehensible manner; and that they are *really* exhibited both to the righteous and the wicked, to the worthy and to the unworthy, receiver. The *Reformed* hold, on the contrary, that the man CHRIST is only present in this ordinance by the external signs of bread and wine; though it must, at the same time, be observed, that this matter is differently explained and represented in the writings of their doctors.

2^{dly}, In their doctrine of the *eternal decrees of God respecting man's salvation*. The *Lutherans* maintain, that the *divine decrees* respecting the salvation or misery of men are founded upon a *previous knowledge* of their sentiments and characters; or, in other words, that God, foreseeing from all eternity the faith, or incredulity of different persons, had reserved eternal happiness for the faithful, and eternal misery for the unbelieving and disobedient. The *Reformed* entertain different sentiments concerning this intricate point. They consider the divine decrees as *free and unconditional*, and as founded on the *will of God*, which is limited by no superior order, and which is above all laws.

3^{dly}, Concerning *some religious rites and institutions*, which the *Reformed* consider as bordering upon superstition, or tending, at least, to promote it; while the *Lutherans* view them in another light, and represent all of them as *tolerable*, and some of them as *useful*. Such are the use of images in the churches, the distinguishing vestments of the clergy, the private confession of sins, the use of wafers in the administration of the Lord's supper, the form of *exorcism* in the celebration of baptism, and other ceremonies of like moment. The *Reformed* doctors insist on the abolition of all these rites and institutions; and that upon this general principle, that the discipline and worship of the Christian church ought to be restored to their primitive simplicity, and freed from the human inventions and additions that were employed by superstition, in the times of ignorance, to render them more striking to the deluded multitude.

XXX. The few heads of difference, between the two communions, which have been now briefly pointed out, have furnished an inexhaustible fund of controversy to the contending parties, and been drawn out into a multitude of intricate questions, and subjects of debate, that, by consequences fairly or injudiciously deduced, have widened the scene of contention, and extended to almost all the important truths of religion. Thus the debate, concerning the *manner in which the body and blood of CHRIST are present in the Eucharist*, opened to the disputants a large field of inquiry, in which the nature and fruits of the institutions called *Sacraments*, the majesty and glory of CHRIST's *humanity*, together with the *communication* of the divine perfections to it, and that inward frame of spirit that is required in the worship that is addressed to the divine Saviour were carefully examined. In a like manner, the controversy, which had for its object *the divine decrees*, led the doctors, by whom it was carried on, into the most subtle and profound researches concerning the nature of the divine attributes, particularly those

The moment
and importance
of these dif-
ferences.

CENT. XVI. of justice and goodness, the doctrines of *fate or necessity*, the connexion between *human liberty* and *divine prescience*, the extent of God's love to mankind, and of the benefits that arise from the merits of CHRIST as mediator, the operations of that divine spirit or power that rectifies the wills and sanctifies the affections of men, the perseverance of the *elect* in their covenant with God, and in a state of salvation, and other points of great moment and importance. The subject of debate that was drawn from the *use of certain external rites and ceremonies* in religious worship, was also productive of several questions and inquiries. For besides the researches into the origin and antiquity of certain institutions, to which it gave occasion, it naturally led to a discussion of the following important questions: *viz. What are the special marks that characterize things INDIFFERENT? — How far is it lawful to comply with the demands of an adversary, whose opposition is only directed against things esteemed indifferent in their own nature? — What is the extent of Christian liberty? — Whether or no it be lawful to retain, in condescension to the prejudices of the people, or with a view to their benefit, certain ancient rites and institutions, which, although they carry a superstitious aspect, may nevertheless be susceptible of a favourable and rational interpretation?*

To whom the
right of govern-
ing the church
belongs.

XXXI. It has always been a question, much debated among protestants, and more especially in *England* and *Holland*, where it has excited great commotions and tumults, *to whom the right of governing the church and the power of deciding in religious matters properly belong?* This controversy has been determined in favour of those, who maintain, that the power of deciding, in matters of religious doctrine, discipline, and government, is, by the appointment of CHRIST himself, vested in the church, and therefore ought, by no means, to be intrusted with, or exercised by, the civil magistrate; while, at the same time, they grant, that it is the business of the latter to assist the church with his protection and advice, to convoke and preside in its synods and councils, to take care that the clergy do not attempt or carry on any thing that may be prejudicial to the interests of the state, and, by his authority, to confirm the validity and secure the execution of the ecclesiastical laws enacted by the church under his inspection. It is true, that from the time of HENRY VIII, the kings of *England* consider themselves as *supreme heads of the church*, and that, in relation to its *spiritual, as well as its temporal, concerns*; and it is plain enough, that, on the strength of this important title, both HENRY VIII and his son EDWARD assumed an extensive authority and jurisdiction in the church, and looked upon their spiritual power, as equal to that which had been unworthily enjoyed by the Roman pontif [w]. But QUEEN ELIZABETH receded considerably from these high pretensions, and diminished the spiritual power of her successors, by declaring that the jurisdiction of the kings of *England* extended only to the ministers of religion, and not to religion itself; to the rulers of the church, and not to the church itself; or, in other words, that the persons of the clergy were alone subject to their civil authority [x]. Ac-

[w] See NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 17.

[x] See COURAYER, *Supplément aux deux Ouvrages pour la Défense de la validité des Ordinations Anglicanes*, chap. xv. p. 416. [This must be understood, with many restrictions, if it can be at

cordingly,

cordingly, we see that the constitution of the church of *England* resembles CENT. XVI. perfectly that of the state, and that there is a striking analogy between the civil and ecclesiastical government established in that country. The clergy, consisting of the upper and lower houses of convocation, are immediately assembled by the archbishop of *Canterbury* in consequence of an order from the sovereign, and propose in these meetings, by common consent, such measures as seem necessary to the well-being of the church; these measures are laid before the king and parliament, and derive from their approbation and authority the force of laws [y]. But it must be acknowledged, that this matter has given occasion to much altercation and debate, nor has it been found easy to fix the extent of the jurisdiction and prerogatives of these great bodies in a manner conformable to their respective pretensions, since the king and his council explain them in one way, and the clergy, more especially those who are zealous for the spiritual supremacy and independency of the church, understand them in another. The truth of the matter is plainly this, that the ecclesiastical polity in *England* has never acquired a stable and consistent form, nor been reduced to clear and certain principles. It has rather been carried on and administered by ancient custom and precedent, than defined and fixed by any regular system of laws and institutions.

XXXII. If it was not an easy matter to determine in what hands the power of deciding affairs of a religious nature was to be lodged, it was no less difficult to fix the Form of ecclesiastical government in which this power was to be administered. Many vehement disputes were kindled on this subject, which neither the lapse of time, nor the efforts of human wisdom, have been able to bring to an amicable issue. The Republic of *Geneva*, in consequence of the counsels of CALVIN, judged it proper that the particular affairs of each church should be directed by a body of elders or *presbyters*, all invested with an equal degree of power and authority; that matters of a more public and important nature were to be submitted to the judgment of an assembly, or synod, composed of elders chosen as deputies by the churches of a whole province or district; and that all affairs of such extensive influence and high moment, as concerned the welfare of the sacred community in general, should be examined and decided, as in times of old, by a general assembly of the whole church. This form of ecclesiastical government the church of *Geneva* adopted for itself [z], and left no intreaties

The Form of ecclesiastical government among the Reformed.

all admitted. The whole tenor of Queen ELIZABETH's reign shewed plainly that she did not pretend to less power in religious matters than any of her predecessors.]

[y] JO. COSINUS, *De Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Religione et Disciplina*, in the learned THOMAS SMITH'S *Vitæ Eruditiss. Virorum*, published at London in 4^{to} in the year 1707.—See also DAV. WILKINS *De Veteri et Moderna Synodi Anglic. Constitutione*, tom. i. *Concil. Magn. Britann.* p. vii. —NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 2, 3, 15. 132.

[z] The account Dr. MOSHEIM gives here and above (§ XII. of this chapter) of the Form of Ecclesiastical Government established by CALVIN at *Geneva*, is far from being accurate. There are but two ecclesiastical bodies in that Republic, viz. the *Venerable Company* of the pastors and professors, and the *Consistory*; for a just description of which, see the judicious Mr. KEATE'S *Short Account of the Ancient History, present Government and Laws of the Republic of Geneva*, printed by Doddsley in the year 1761, p. 110. 112. 121. 124.—I would only remark, that, what this sensible author observes, with respect to the *Consistory*, p. 124. of his interesting performance,

OR

CENT. XVI. or methods of persuasion unemployed, that might recommend it to the other Reformed churches with which they lived in fraternal communion. But it was obstinately rejected by the English clergy, who regarded as sacred and immutable that ancient form of spiritual government, according to which a certain district or *diocese* is committed to the care and inspection of one ruler or bishop, to whom the *presbyters* of each church are subject, as also the *deacons* are to the *presbyters*; while those affairs that concern the general interests of the church are treated in an assembly of bishops, and of such ecclesiastics as are next to them in rank and dignity. This form of episcopal polity was, with some small exceptions, adopted by the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren [a], who were become one of the Reformed churches; but it was highly displeasing to those among the protestants, who had embraced the sentiments and discipline of CALVIN. The dissensions, occasioned by these different schemes of ecclesiastical polity, were every way adapted to produce a violent schism in the church; and that so much the more, as each of the contending parties pretended to derive their respective plan from the injunctions of CHRIST and the practice of his disciples. And, in effect, it divided the English nation into two parties, who, during a long time, treated each other with great animosity and bitterness, and whose feuds, on many occasions, proved detrimental to the civil interests and prosperity of the nation. This schism, however, which did such mischief in *England*, was, by the prudence and piety of a few great and excellent divines, confined to that country, and prevented from either becoming universal or interrupting the fraternal union, that prevailed between the church of *England* and the Reformed churches abroad. The worthy men, that thus set bounds to the influence of these unhappy divisions, found great opposition made, by the suggestions of bigotry, to their charitable purpose. To maintain, however, the bonds of union between the episcopal church of *England* and the presbyterian churches in foreign countries, they laid down the following maxim, which, though it be not universally adopted, tends nevertheless to the preservation of external concord among the *Reformed*, viz. "That JESUS CHRIST has left upon record no express injunctions with respect to the external form of government, that is to be observed in his

belongs principally, if not wholly, to the *Venerable Company*.—Dr. MOSHEIM seems to have been led into this mistake by imagining that the Ecclesiastical Form of Government established in *Scotland*, where indeed all church affairs are managed by *consistorial*, *provincial*, and *national* assemblies, or, in other words, by *presbyteries*, *synods*, and *general synods*, was a direct transcript of the hierarchy of *Geneva*. It is also probable, that he may have been deceived by reading in NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, that the Scottish reformers approved of the discipline of the Reformed churches of *Geneva* and *Switzerland*, and followed their plan of Ecclesiastical Government. But he ought to have observed, that this approbation and imitation related only to the *democratical* form of the church of *Geneva*, and the parity of its ministers. Be that as it may, the plan of government, which our historian here supposes to have place at *Geneva*, is in reality that, which is observed in *Scotland*, and of which no more than the first and fundamental principles were taken from the discipline of CALVIN. The small territory of *Geneva* would not admit of such a form of ecclesiastical polity as Dr. MOSHEIM here describes.]

[a] See *Epist. de Ordinatio et Successione Episcopali, in unitate Fratrum Bohem. conservata*, in CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFII *Institution. Juris Eccles.* p. 410.

“church; and, consequently, that every nation hath a right to establish CENT. XVI.
 “such a Form, as seemeth conducive to the interests, and suitable to the
 “peculiar state, circumstances, and exigencies of the community, provided,
 “that such an establishment be, in no respect prejudicial to truth, or favour-
 “able to the revival of superstition [b].”

XXXIII. It was the opinion of CALVIN, not only that flagitious and
 profligate members were to be cut off from the sacred society, and excluded
 from the communion of the church, but also that men of dissolute and
 licentious lives were punishable by the laws of the state and the arm of the
 civil magistrate. In this he differed entirely from ZUINGLE, who, supposing
 that all authority, of every kind, was lodged in the hands of the magistrate
 alone, would not allow to the ministers of the church the power of exclud-
 ing flagitious offenders from its communion, or withholding from them the
 participation of its sacraments [c]. But the credit and influence of CALVIN
 were so great at *Geneva*, that he accomplished his purpose, even in the face
 of a formidable opposition from various quarters. He established the
 severest rules of discipline to correct the licentious manners of the times,
 by which he exposed himself to innumerable perils from the malignity and
 resentment of the dissolute, and to perpetual contests with the patrons of
 voluptuousness and immorality. He executed, moreover, these rules of
 discipline with the utmost rigour, had them strengthened and supported by
 the authority of the state, excluded obstinate offenders from the communion
 of the church by the judicial sentence of the *consistory*, and even went so far
 as to procure their banishment from the city; not to mention other kinds of
 punishment of no mild nature, which at his desire, were inflicted upon men
 of loose principles and irregular lives [d]. The clergy, in *Switzerland*,
 were highly pleased with the form of church-government that had been
 established at *Geneva*, and ardently desirous of a greater degree of power to
 restrain the insolence of obstinate sinners and a larger share of authority in

The state of
 church-discipline.

[b] See SPANHEMII *Opera*, tom. ii. lib. viii, ix. p. 1055. This was the general opinion of the British divines that lived in the earliest period of the Reformation, and was first abandoned by Archbishop WHITGIFT. See NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, tom. iii. p. 140.

[c] See a remarkable letter of RUD. GUALTIERI, in FUESLIN'S *Centuria I, Epistolarum à Reformatoribus Helveticis scriptarum*, p. 478. where he expresses himself thus: *Excommunicationem neque Zuinglius . . . neque Bullingerus unquam probarunt et . . . obstiterunt iis qui eam aliquando voluerunt introducere . . . Basileæ quidem Oecolampadius multum dissuadente Zuinglio instituerat . . . sed adeo non durabilis fuit illa constitutio, ut Oecolampadius illam abrogavit, &c.* See also p. 90.

[d] Of all the undertakings of CALVIN, there was none that involved him in so much trouble or exposed him to such imminent danger, as the plan he had formed, with such resolution and fortitude, of purging the church by the exclusion of obstinate and scandalous offenders, and inflicting severe punishments on all such as violated the laws, enacted by the church, or by the *Consistory*, which was its representative. See *The Life of Calvin*, composed by BEZA, and prefixed to his letters.—SPON'S *Histoire de Geneve*, and particularly the *Notes*, tom. ii. p. 45. 65.—CALVIN'S *Letters*, and more especially those addressed to *Jaques de Bourgogne*, published at *Amsterdam* in 8°. in the year 1744, p. 126, 127. 132. 153. 157.—The party at *Geneva*, which CALVIN called the sect of *Libertines*, (because they defended the licentious customs of ancient times, the erection of stews, and such like matters, not only by their discourse and their actions, but even by force of arms) was both numerous and powerful. But the courage and resolution of this great reformer gained the ascendant, and triumphed over the opposition of his enemies.

the

CENT. XVI the church, than they were intrusted with by the ecclesiastical constitution of ZUINGLE. They devoutly wished that the discipline of CALVIN might be followed in their Cantons, and even made some attempts for that purpose. But their desires and their endeavours were equally vain; for the cantons of Bern, Zurich, and Basil, distinguished themselves among the others in opposing this change, and would, by no means, permit the bounds, that ZUINGLE had set to the jurisdiction of the church, to be removed, nor its power and authority to be augmented, in any respect [e].

The state of
learning among
the Reformed.

XXXIV. All the various branches of learning, whether sacred or profane, flourished among the Reformed during this century, as appears evidently by the great number of excellent productions, which have been transmitted to our times. ZUINGLE, indeed, seemed disposed to exclude philosophy from the pale of the church [f]; but in this inconsiderate purpose he had few followers, and the succeeding doctors of the Helvetic church were soon persuaded of the necessity of philosophical knowledge, more especially in controversies and researches of a theological kind. Hence it was, that, in the year 1558, an academy was founded at Geneva by CALVIN, whose first care was to place in this new seminary a professor of philosophy for the instruction of youth in the principles of reasoning. It is true, indeed, that this professor had a very limited province assigned him, being obliged to confine his instructions to a mere interpretation of the precepts of ARISTOTLE, who at this time was the oracle of all the public schools [g], and whose philosophical principles and method were exclusively adopted by all the other Reformed academies; though it is certain, that the philosophy of RAMUS was, for some time, preferred by many of the doctors at Basil to that of the Stagirite [h].

The interpreters
and commenta-
tors of scripture.

XXXV. The Reformed church, from its very infancy, produced a great number of expositors of scripture, whose learned and excellent commentaries deserve a memorable place [i] in the history of theological science. The exposition that ZUINGLE has given of the greatest part of the books of the New Testament is far from being destitute of merit [k]. He was succeeded

[e] See the account of the tumults and commotions of LAUSANNE, in the *Museum Helveticum*, tom. ii. p. 119 — The disputes, that were carried on, upon this occasion, in the Palatinate, which adopted the ecclesiastical discipline of Geneva, are recorded by ALTINGIUS, in his *Hist. Eccles. Palat.* and by STRUVIUS, in his *Hist. Eccles. Palat. German.* p. 212.

[f] ZUINGLE, in the Dedication of his book, *De vera et falsa Religione* to FRANCIS I, king of France, expresses himself in the following terms: *Philosophiæ interdictum est à Christi Scholis: at isti (Sorbonistæ) fecerunt eam Coelestis verbi magistrum.*

[g] BEZA, in his *Epistolæ Theologicæ* (ep. xxxvi. p. 156.) speaks thus: *Certum nobis ac constitutum est, et in ipsis tradendis logicis et in ceteris explicandis disciplinis ab Aristotelis sententia ne tantillum quidem deflectere.*

[h] See CASP. BRANDTII *Vita Jacobi Arminii*, p. 12, 13. 22.

[i] Dr. MOSHEIM pays a tribute to these great men of the Reformed church, that seems to be extorted by justice, with a kind of effort, from the spirit of party. He says, that ZUINGLE's labours are not contemptible; that CALVIN attempted an illustration of the sacred writings; that the New Testament of BEZA has not, even at this day, entirely lost the reputation it formerly enjoyed. This is faint praise; and therefore the translator has, without departing from the tenor of the author's phraseology, animated a little the coldness of his panegyric.]

[k] It was not only on the Books of the New Testament that ZUINGLE employed his very learned and excellent labours. He expounded the Book of Genesis, together with the twenty by

by BULLINGER, OECOLAMPADIUS, and MUSCULUS, and also by others, who, though inferior to these great men in erudition and genius, deserve nevertheless a certain degree of approbation and esteem. But the two divines, who shone with a superior and unrivalled lustre in this learned list of sacred expositors, were JOHN CALVIN and THEODORE BEZA. The former composed an excellent commentary on almost all the books of Holy Writ; and the latter published a Latin Version of the *New Testament*, enriched with theological and critical observations, which has passed through many editions, and enjoys, at this day, a considerable part of the reputation and applause, with which it was crowned at its first appearance. It must be acknowledged to the honour of the greatest part of these commentators, that, wisely neglecting those allegorical significations and mystical meanings that the irregular fancies of former expositors had attributed to the terms of Holy Writ, they employed their whole diligence and industry in investigating the literal sense, the full energy of the words of scripture, in order to find out the true intention of the sacred writer. It must, however, be observed on the other hand, that some of these interpreters, and more especially CALVIN, have been sharply censured for applying to the temporal state and circumstances of the Jews, several prophecies, that point to the Messiah and to the Christian dispensation in the most evident and palpable manner, and thus removing some of the most striking arguments in favour of the divinity of the Gospel [1].

XXXVI. The state of theology and the revolutions it underwent, among the Helvetic and the other Reformed churches, were pretty much the same with what it met with among the Lutherans. ZUINGLE was one of the first Reformed doctors who reduced that sacred science into a certain sort of order, in his book *Concerning true and false Religion*, which contained a brief exposition of the principal doctrines of Christianity. This production was followed by one much more comprehensive in its contents and perfect in its kind, composed by CALVIN, and entitled, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, which held in the Reformed churches the same rank, authority, and credit, that the *Loci Communes* of MELANCTHON obtained among us [m]. The example of CALVIN animated the doctors of his communion, and produced a great number of writers of *Common Place Divinity*, some more, others less voluminous, among which MUSCULUS, PETER MARTYR, and PISCATOR particularly excelled. The most ancient of these writers are, generally speaking, the best, on account of their simplicity, and clearness, being untainted with that affectation of subtilty and that scholastic spirit that have eclipsed the merit of many a good genius. CALVIN was a model in this

The theological doctrine of the Reformed church.

four first chapters of *Exodus*, and gave New Versions of the *Book of Psalms*, of the Prophecies of *Isaiah* and *Jeremiah*.]

[1] See ÆGIDIÛ HUNNII *Calvinus Judaizans*, published at Wittemberg in 8^{vo}. in the year 1595, which was refuted by DAVID. PAREUS, in a book published the same year under the title of *Calvinus Orthodoxus*.

[(m) The reader must not forget that the learned author of this History is a Lutheran. This advertisement will undoubtedly appear superfluous to the attentive reader.]

CENT. XVI. respect, more especially in his *Institutes*; a work, remarkable for the finest elegance of stile and the greatest ease and perspicuity of expression, together with the most perfect simplicity of method and clearness of argument. But this simplicity was soon effaced by the intricate science of the schools. The philosophy of ARISTOTLE, which was taught in, almost, all the seminaries of learning, and suffered much from falling into bad hands, insinuated itself into the regions of theology, and rendered them barren, thorny, intricate, and gloomy, by the enormous multitude of barbarous terms, captious questions, minute distinctions, and useless subtilties that followed in its train [n].

The state of practical divinity or morality.

XXXVII. The Reformed doctors of this century generally concluded their treatises of didactic theology with a delineation of the moral duties that are incumbent upon Christians, and the rules of practice that are prescribed in the Gospel. This method was observed by CALVIN, and was followed, out of respect for his example, by almost all the divines of his communion, who looked upon him as their model and their guide. This eminent man, towards the conclusion of his *Institutes*, speaks of the power of the magistrate, and the ends of civil government; and in the last chapter gives the portraiture

[n] It must however be acknowledged, that the scholastic method of teaching theology, seems to have first infected our [the Lutheran] church, though the contagion spread itself, soon after, among the Reformed doctors. It was certainly very recent in Holland at the time of the famous synod of Dort. In this assembly MACCOVIUS, professor at Franeker, a man deeply versed in all the mysteries of the scholastic philosophy, was accused of heresy by his colleague SIERAND KUBBERT. When the matter was examined, the synod gave it as their opinion, that MACCOVIUS was unjustly accused of heresy, but that, in his divinity lectures, he had not followed that simplicity of method, and clearness of expression, that are commendable in a public teacher of Christianity; and that he rather followed the subtle manner of the scholastic doctors, than the plain and unaffected phraseology of the inspired writers. The decision of the synod is expressed by WALTER BALCANQUAL (in the acts of that ecclesiastical assembly that are subjoined to his letters to SIR DUDLEY CARLETON), in the following words: *Maccovium . . . nullius hareseos ream teneri . . . peccasse eum, quod quibusdam ambiguis et obscuris scholasticis phrasibus usus sit. QUOD SCHOLASTICUM DOCTENDI MODUM CONFERVA IN BEUGICIS ACADEMIIS INTRODUCERE . . . Monendum esse eum, ut cum spiritu sancto loquatur, non cum Ballarmino aut Suarezio* *. These admonitions produced but little effect on MACCOVIUS, as appears by his theological writings, which are richly seasoned with scholastic wit, and intricate speculations. He therefore appears to have been the first, who introduced the subtilties of philosophy into the theological system of the Reformed churches in Holland. He was not, however, alone in this attempt, but was seconded by the acute Mr. WILLIAM AMES, minister of the English church at the Hague, and several others of the same scholastic turn. This method of teaching theology must have been in use among, almost, all the Reformed doctors before the synod of Dort, if we give credit to EPISCOPUS, who, in the last discourse he addressed to his disciples at Leyden, tells them that he had carefully avoided this scholastic divinity; and that this was the principal cause that had drawn on him the vehement hatred and opposition of all the other professors and teachers of theology. His words are as follow: *Videbam veritatem multarum et maximarum rerum in ipsa scriptura sacra, elaboratis humana industria phrasibus, ingeniosis vocalarum fictionibus, locorum communium artificiosis texturis, exquisitis terminorum ac formularum inventionibus adeo involutam, perplexam et intricatam redditam esse, ut Oedipus sepe opus esset ad sphingem illam theologicam enodandam. Ita est, ut hinc primæ lacrymæ — Reducendam itaque terminorum apostolicorum et cuiusvis obolorum simplicitatem semper sequendam putavi, et sequestrandam, quas academia et scholæ tanquam proprias sibi vendicant, logicas, philosophicasque speculationes et dictiones.* See PHILIPPI LIMBORCHII *Vita Episcopii*, p. 123, 124.

* See the *Acta Synodi Dord.* in HALE's *Golden Remains*, p. 161. — & PHILIPPI LIMBORCHII *Epistolæ Ecclesiasticæ*, Collect. p. 574.

of the *life and manners of a true Christian*, but in a much more concise manner than the copiousness, dignity, and importance of the subject seemed to require. The progress of morality among the Reformed, was obstructed by the very same means that retarded its improvement among us [*Lutherans*]. It was neglected amidst the tumult of controversy; and while every pen was drawn to maintain certain *systems of doctrine*, few were employed in cultivating or promoting that noblest of all sciences, which has *virtue, life, and manners* for its objects.

This sublime science, which CALVIN and his associates had left in a rude and imperfect state, was first reduced into some kind of form, and explained, with a certain degree of accuracy and precision, by WILLIAM PERKINS [o], an English divine, as the Reformed doctors universally allow. He was seconded in this laudable undertaking by TELINGIUS, a native of *Holland*, whose writings were composed in the Dutch language. It was by a worthy and pious spirit of emulation, excited by the example of these two doctors, that WILLIAM AMES, a native of *Scotland*, and professor of divinity at *Franecker* [p], was engaged to compose a compleat Body of Christian Morality [q]. These writers were succeeded by others, who still threw farther light on this important science.

XXXVIII. The Reformed church was less disturbed, during this century, by sects, divisions, and theological disputes, than the Lutheran, which was often a prey to the most unhappy dissensions. This circumstance is looked upon by the former as a matter of triumph, though it may be very easily

The contests of Calvin with the Spiritual Libertines.

[o] Mr. WILLIAM PERKINS was born at *Marston* in *Warwickshire*, in the first year of Queen ELIZABETH, and educated in *Christ's College Cambridge*, of which he was Fellow. He was one of the most famous practical writers and preachers of his age. His puritanical and non-conforming principles exposed him to the cognizance of the *High Commission Court*; but his peaceable behaviour and eminent reputation, in the learned world, procured him an exemption from the persecutions that fell upon his brethren. His works, which were printed in three volumes, folio, afford abundant proofs of his piety and industry, especially when it is considered that he died in the 44th year of his age.]

[p] Dr. WILLIAM AMES, educated at *Cambridge*, under Mr. PERKINS, fled from the persecution of Archbishop BANCROFT, and became minister of the English church at the *Hague*, from whence he was invited by the states of *Friesland* to the divinity chair in the University of *Franecker*, which he filled with great reputation during the space of twelve years. He was at the synod of *Dort*, and informed King JAMES's ambassador at the *Hague*, from time to time, of the debates of that assembly. Besides his controversial writings against the Arminians, he published the following: *Medulla Theologiæ* (the work here referred to by Dr. MOSHEIM); *Manuductio Logica*;—*Cases of Conscience*;—*Analysis on the Book of Psalms*;—*Notes on the First and Second Epistles of St. Peter*, &c. These productions are not void of merit, considering the times in which they were written.]

[q] In the Dedication and Preface of his famous book *De Conscientia et ejus jure*, Dr. AMES observes (*Præfat.* p. 3.) that an excessive zeal for doctrine had produced an unhappy neglect of morality, *Quod hæc pars prophetiæ* (i. e. morality) *hætenus minus fuerit exculta, hoc inde fuit, quod primipilares nostri perpetuo in acie adversus hostes pugnare, fidem propugnare, et aream ecclesiæ purgare, necessitate quadam cogebantur, ita ut agros et vineas plantare et rigare non potuerint ex voto, sicut bello fervente usu venire solet.* The address to the students of *Franecker*, which is subjoined to this book under the title of *Parænesis ad Studiosos*, &c. deserves to be perused, as it confirms farther what has been already observed with respect to the neglect of the science of morality. *Theologi*, says he, *præclare se instructos putant ad omnes officii sui partes, si dogmata tantum intelligant.—Neque tamen omnia dogmata scrutantur, sed illa sola, quæ præcipue solent agitari et in controversiam vocari.*"]

CENT. XVI. accounted for by all such as are acquainted with the History of the Reformed Church[r]. We have, however, in the writings of CALVIN, an account and also a refutation of a most pernicious sect, that sprung up in that church; and produced troubles of a more deplorable kind than any that happened in our community[s]. This odious sect, which assumed the denominations of *Libertines* and *Spiritual Brethren and Sisters* arose in *Flanders*, was headed by POCKESIUS, RUFFUS, and QUINTIN, got a certain footing in *France* through the favour and protection of MARGARET, queen of *Navarre*, and sister to FRANCIS I, and found patrons in several of the Reformed churches[t]. Their doctrine, as far as it can be known by the writings of CALVIN and its other antagonists (for these fanatics published no account of their tenets that is come to my knowledge) amounted to the following propositions: "That the Deity was the sole *operating cause* in the mind of man, and the immediate *author* of all human actions; that, consequently, the distinctions of *good* and *evil*, that had been established with respect to these actions, were false and groundless, and that men could not, properly speaking, commit sin; that religion consisted in the union of the spirit or rational soul with the supreme Being; that all those who had attained this happy union by sublime contemplation and elevation of mind, were then allowed to indulge, without exception or restraint, their appetites and passions; that all their actions and pursuits were then perfectly innocent; and that, after the death of the body, they were to be united to the Deity." These extravagant tenets resemble, in such a striking manner, the opinions of the *Beghards*, or *Brethren of the Free Spirit*, that it appears to me, beyond all doubt, that the *Libertines*, or *Spirituals*, now under consideration, were no more than a remnant of that ancient sect. The place of their origin confirms this hypothesis; since it is well known, that, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, *Flanders* almost swarmed with licentious fanatics of this kind.

And with the
Libertines of
Geneva.

XXXIX. We must not confound, as is frequently done, with these fanatics, another kind of *Libertines*, whom CALVIN had to combat, and who gave him much trouble and perplexity during the whole course of his life and ministry, I mean the *Libertines of Geneva*. These were rather a cabal of rakes than a sect of fanatics. For they made no pretences to any religious system, but pleaded only for the liberty of leading voluptuous and immoral lives. This cabal was composed of a certain number of licentious citizens, who could not bear the severe discipline of CALVIN, who punished with rigour not only dissolute manners, but also whatever carried the aspect of irreligion and impiety. This irregular troop stood forth in defence of the licentiousness and dissipation that had reigned, in their city, before the Reformation, pleaded for the continuance of those brothels, banquettings,

[(r) Dr. MOSHEIM ought to have given us a hint of his manner of accounting for this, to avoid the suspicion of having been somewhat at a loss for a *favourable* solution.]

[(s) Why all these comparisons? Our author seems, on some occasions, to tinge his historical relation with the spirit of party.]

[(t) See CALVINI *Instructio adversus fanaticam et furiosam sectam Libertinorum, qui se spirituales vocant*, in *Tractatibus ejus Theologicis*.

and

and other entertainments of a sensual kind which the regulations of CALVIN CENT. XVI. were designed to abolish, and employed all the bitterness of reproach and invective, all the resources of fraud and violence, all the powers of faction to accomplish their purpose [u]. In this turbulent cabal there were several persons, who were not only notorious for their dissolute and scandalous manner of living, but also for their atheistical impiety and contempt of all religion. Of this odious class was GRUET, who attacked CALVIN with the utmost animosity and fury, calling him bishop *Asculanensis*, the new pope, and branding him with other contumelious denominations of a like nature. This GRUET denied the divinity of the Christian religion, the immortality of the soul, the difference between moral good and evil, and rejected, with disdain, the doctrines that are held the most sacred among Christians; for which impieties he was at last brought before the civil tribunals, in the year 1550, and was condemned to death [w].

XL. The opposition that was made to CALVIN did not end here. He had contests of another kind to sustain against those, who could not relish his theological system, and, more especially, his melancholy and discouraging doctrine in relation to *eternal* and *absolute* Decrees. These adversaries felt, by a disagreeable experience, the warmth and violence of his haughty temper, and that impatience of contradiction that arose from an over-jealous concern for his honour, or rather for his unrivalled supremacy. He would not suffer them to remain at *Geneva*; nay, in the heat of the controversy, being carried away by the impetuosity of his passions, he accused them of crimes, from which they have been fully absolved by the impartial judgment of unprejudiced posterity [x]. Among these victims of CALVIN's unlimited power and excessive zeal, we may reckon SEBASTIAN CASTALIO, master of the public school at *Geneva*, who, though not exempt from failings [y], was nevertheless a man of probity, and was also remarkable for the extent of his learning and the elegance of his taste. As this learned man could not approve of all the measures that were followed, nor indeed of all the opinions that were entertained, by CALVIN and his colleagues, and particularly that of absolute and unconditional predestination, he was deposed from his office in the year 1544, and banished the city. The magistrates of *Basil* received, nevertheless, this ingenious exile, and gave him the Greek professorship in their university [z].

Calvin's disputes
with Castalio,

[u] SPON's *Histoire de Geneve*, tom. ii. p. 44. in the Notes of the editor, in the edition in 12^{mo}. published at *Geneva* in 1730.

[w] Id. tom. ii. p. 47. in the Notes.

[x] At this day, we may venture to speak thus freely of the rash decisions of CALVIN, since even the Doctors of *Geneva*, as well as those of the other Reformed churches, ingenuously acknowledge, that the eminent talents and excellent qualities of that great man were accompanied with great defects, for which, however, they plead indulgence in consideration of his services and virtues. See the Notes to SPON's *Histoire de Geneve*, tom. ii. p. 110. as also the Preface to CALVIN's *Letters to Jaques de Bourgogne*, p. 19.

[(y) See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article CASTALIO, in which the merit and demerit of that learned man seem to be impartially and accurately examined.]

[z] See UYTENBOGARD'S *Ecclesiastical History*, written in Dutch, part II. p. 70—73.

CENT. XVI.

with Bolsec,

XLI. A like fate happened to JEROM BOLSEC, a French monk of the Carmelite order, who, though much inferior to CASTALIO in genius and learning, was nevertheless judged worthy of esteem on account of the motive that brought him to *Geneva*; for it was a conviction of the excellence of the protestant religion that engaged him to abandon the monastic retreats of superstition, and to repair to this city where he followed the profession of physic. His imprudence, however, was great, and was the principal cause of the misfortunes that befel him. It led him, in the year 1551, to lift up his voice in the full congregation after the conclusion of divine worship, and to declaim, in the most indecent manner, against the doctrine of *absolute Decrees*; for which he was cast into prison, and, soon after, sent into banishment. He then returned to the place of his nativity, and to the communion of *Rome*, and published the most bitter and slanderous libels, in which the reputation, conduct, and morals of CALVIN and BEZA were cruelly attacked [a]. From this treatment of BOLSEC arose the misunderstanding between CALVIN and JACQUES DE BOURGOGNE, a man illustrious by his descent from the dukes of *Burgundy*, who was CALVIN's great patron and intimate friend, and who had settled at *Geneva* with no other view than to enjoy the pleasure of conversing with him. JACQUES DE BOURGOGNE had employed BOLSEC as his physician, and was so well satisfied with his services, that he endeavoured to support him and to prevent his being ruined by the enmity and authority of CALVIN. This incensed the latter to such a degree, that he turned the force of his resentment against this illustrious nobleman, who, to avoid his vengeance, removed from *Geneva*, and passed the remainder of his days in a rural retreat [b].

and with Ochinas.

XLII. BERNARDIN OCHINUS, a native of *Siena*, and, before his conversion, general of the order of Capuchins, was, in the year 1543, banished from *Switzerland* in consequence of a sentence passed upon him by the Helvetic church. This proselyte, who was a man of a fertile imagination, and a lively and subtle turn of mind, had been invited to *Zurich* as pastor of the Italian church established in that city. But the freedom, or rather the licentiousness, of his sentiments exposed him justly to the displeasure of those, who had been his patrons and protectors. For among many other opinions, very different from those that were commonly received, he maintained that the law, which confined a husband to one wife, was susceptible of exceptions in certain cases. In his writings also, he propagated several notions, that were repugnant to the theological system of the Helvetic doctors, and pushed his inquiries into many subjects of importance with a boldness and freedom, that were by no means suitable to the genius and spirit of the age in which he lived. Some have, however, undertaken

where that author endeavours to defend the innocence of CASTALIO. See also COLOMESII *Italia Orientalis*, p. 99.—BAYLE's *Dict.* tom. i. p. 792.

[a] See BAYLE's *Dict.* at the article BOLSEC.—SPON's *Hist. de Geneve*, tom. ii. p. 55. in the *Notes*.—*Biblioth. Raisonnée*, tom. xxxii. p. 446. tom. xxxiv. p. 409.

[b] See *Lettres de CALVIN à Jaques de Bourgogne*, Preface, p. 8.—*La Bibliothèque Raisonnée*, tom. xxxii. p. 444. tom. xxxiv. p. 406.

his defence, and have alledged in his behalf, that the errors he maintained at the time of his banishment (when, worn out with age, and oppressed with poverty, he was rather an object of compassion, than of resentment) were not of such a heinous nature as to justify so severe a punishment. Be that as it may, this unfortunate exile retired into *Poland*, where he embraced the communion of the Anti-trinitarians and Anabaptists [c], and ended his days in the year 1564.

XLIII. It is remarkable enough that those very doctors, who animadverted with such severity upon all those who dared to dissent from any part of their theological system, thought proper, nevertheless, to behave with the greatest circumspection, and the most pacific spirit of mildness, in the long controversy that was carried on with such animosity between the *Puritans*, and the abettors of *episcopacy* in *England*. For if, on the one hand, they could not but stand well affected to the *Puritans*, who were steadfast defenders of the discipline and sentiments of the *Helvetic* church; so, on the other, they were connected with the episcopal doctors by the bonds of Christian communion and fraternal love. In this critical situation their whole thoughts were turned towards reconciliation and peace; and they exhorted their brethren, the *Puritans*, to put on a spirit of meekness and forbearance towards the episcopal church, and not to break the bonds of charity and communion with its rulers or its members. Such was the gentle spirit of the doctors in *Switzerland* towards the church of *England*, notwithstanding the severe treatment, the greatest part of the *Reformed* had received from that church, which constantly insisted on the divine origin of its government and discipline, and scarcely allowed the other *Reformed* communities the privileges, or even the denomination, of a true church. This moderation of the *Helvetic* doctors was the dictate of prudence. They did not think it expedient to contend with a generous and flourishing people, nor to incur the displeasure of a mighty queen, whose authority seemed to extend not only to her own dominions, but even to the *United Provinces*, which were placed in her neighbourhood, and, in some measure, under her protection. Nor did the apprehensions of a general schism in the *Reformed* church contribute a little to render them meek, moderate, and pacific. It is one thing to punish and excommunicate a handful of weak and unsupported individuals, who attempt to disturb the tranquillity of the state by the introduction of opinions, which, though neither highly absurd nor of dangerous consequence, have yet the demerit of novelty; and another to irritate, or promote divisions in a flourishing church, which, though weakened more or less by intestine feuds, is yet both powerful and respectable in a high degree. Besides, the dispute between the church of *England* and the other *Reformed* churches did not, as yet, turn upon points of doctrine, but only on the rites

The controversy between the church of *England* and the *Puritans*.

The origin of the controversy between the church of *England* and the *Puritans*.

[c] BOVERII *Annales Capucinarum*.—Together with a book, entitled, *La guerre Scraphique ou Histoire des perils qu'a couru la barbe des Capucins*, livr. ii. p. 147. livr. iii. p. 190. 230.—*Observationes Halenses Latine*, tom. iv. *Observ.* xx. p. 406. tom. v. *Observ.* i. p. 3.—BAYLE'S *Diction.* at the article OCHIN.—CHRIST. SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar.* p. 4.—NICERON, *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire des hommes illustres*, tom. xix. p. 166.

CEN. XVI. of external worship and the form of ecclesiastical governments. It is, however, to be observed, that in process of time, may soon after the period now under consideration, certain religious doctrines were introduced into the debate between the two churches, that contributed much to widen the breach, and to cast the prospect of reconciliation at a distance [a].

XIV. That the Reformed church abounded, during this century, with great and eminent men justly celebrated for their illustrious talents and universal learning, is too well known, to stand in need of any proof. Besides CALVIN, ZUINGLE, and BEZA, who exhibited to the Republic of Letters amazing instances of genius and erudition, we may place in the list of those, who have gained an immortal name by their writings, OECOLAMPADIUS, BULLINGER, FAREL, VIRET, MARTYR, BIBLIANDER, MUSCULUS, PELICAN, LAVATER, HOSPINIAN, URSINUS, CRANMER, archbishop of Canterbury, SZEGEDINUS, and many others, whose names and merits are recorded by the writers of philological history, and particularly by MELCHIOR ADAM, ANTHONY WOOD, and DANIEL NEAL, the learned and industrious author of the *History of the Puritans*.

Many persons of eminent genius and learning among the Reformed.

and to church.

CHAP. III.

The HISTORY of the ANABAPTISTS or MENNONITES.

The origin of the Anabaptists obscure.

I. THE true origin of that sect which acquired the denomination of *Anabaptists* [e], by their administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion, and derived that of *Mennonites*, from

[a] All the protestant divines of the *Reformed* church, whether Puritans or others, seemed indeed, hitherto, of one mind about the *Doctrines of Faith*. But towards the latter end of Queen ELIZABETH'S reign there arose a party, which were first for softening, and then for overthrowing, the received opinions concerning *Predestination*, *Perseverance*, *Free Will*, *Effectual Grace*, and the *Extent of Christ's Redemption*. These are the doctrines to which Dr. MOSHEIM alludes in this passage. The clergy of the episcopal church began to lean towards the notions concerning these intricate points, which ARMINIUS propagated some time after this; while, on the other hand, the Puritans adhered rigorously to the system of CALVIN. Several episcopal doctors remained attached to the same system, and all these abettors of Calvinism, whether episcopal or presbyterian, were called *Doctrinal Puritans*.]

[e] The modern *Mennonites* reject the denomination of *Anabaptists*, and also disavow the custom of repeating the ceremony of baptism, from whence this denomination is derived. They acknowledge that the ancient *Anabaptists* practised the repetition of baptism to those who joined them from other Christian churches; but they maintain, at the same time, that this custom is at present abolished by far the greatest part of their community. (See HERM. SCHYN *Historia Mennonitarum plenior Deductio*, cap. ii. p. 32.) But here, if I am not much mistaken, these good men forget that ingenuous candour and simplicity, of which, on other occasions, they make such ostentation, and have recourse to artifice in order to disguise the true cause and origin of the denomination in question. They pretend, for instance, that the *Anabaptists*, their ancestors, were so called from their baptizing a second time all adult persons, who left other churches to enter into their communion. But it is certain, that the denomination in question was given them not only on this account, but also, and indeed principally from the following consideration, that they did not look upon those, who had been baptized in a state of infancy, or at a tender age, as rendered, by the administration of this sacrament, true members of the Christian church, and therefore in-

the

the famous man, to whom they owe the greatest part of their present CENT. XVI.
felicity, is hid in the remote depths of antiquity, and is, of consequence, extremely difficult to be ascertained [f]. This uncertainty will not appear

fitted upon their being re-baptized in order to their being received into the communion of the *Anabaptists*. It is likewise certain, that all the churches of that communion, however they may vary in other respects, and differ from each other in their tenets and practices, agree nevertheless in this opinion, and, as yet, persevere obstinately in it. In a more especial manner are the ancient *Flemish Anabaptists* entitled to this denomination. For they not only re-baptize the children, that have been already baptized in other churches, but even observe the same method with respect to persons that are come to the years of reason and discretion. Nay, what is still more remarkable, the different sects of *Anabaptists* deal in the same manner one with another; each sect re-baptizes the persons that enter into its communion, although they have already received that sacrament in another sect of the same denomination; and the reason of this conduct is, that each sect considers its baptism alone as pure and valid. It is indeed to be observed, that there is another class of *Anabaptists*, called *Waterlandians*, who are more moderate in their principles, and wiser in all respects than those now mentioned, and who do not pretend to re-baptize adult persons, who have already been baptized in other Christian churches, or in other sects of their own denomination. This moderate class are however, with propriety, termed *Anabaptists*, on account of their re-baptizing such as had received the Baptismal Rite in a state of infancy or childhood. The patrons of the sect seem, indeed, very studious to conceal a practice, which they cannot deny to take place among them, and their eagerness to conceal it arises from an apprehension of reviving the hatred and severities which formerly pursued them. They are afraid, lest, by acknowledging the truth, the modern *Mennonites* should be considered as the descendants of those flagitious and fanatical *Anabaptists*, of *Munster*, whose enormities rendered their very name odious to all true Christians. All this appears evident from the following passage in SCHYN's *Historia Mennonitarum plenior Deductio*, tom. ii. p. 32. where that author pretends to prove that his brethren are unjustly stigmatized with the odious denomination of *Anabaptists*. His words are: *Anabaptismus ille plane obsolevit et a multis retro annis neminem cujuscunque sectæ Christianæ fidei, JUXTA MANDATUM CHRISTI baptizatum, dum ad nostras Ecclesias transire cupit, rebaptizaverunt, i. e. That species of Anabaptism, with which we are charged, exists no longer, nor has it happened, during the space of many years past, that any person, professing Christianity of whatever church or sect he may have been, and who had been previously baptized ACCORDING TO THE COMMANDMENT OF CHRIST, has been re-baptized upon his entering into our communion.* This passage would, at first sight, induce an un-attentive reader to imagine that there is no such thing among the modern *Mennonites*, as the custom of re-baptizing those who enter into their community. But the words, which we have marked in capitals (*JUXTA MANDATUM CHRISTI, i. e. ACCORDING TO THE COMMANDMENT OF CHRIST*) discover sufficiently the artifice and fraud that lie hid in this apology; for the *Anabaptists* maintain, that there is no commandment of Christ in favour of infant baptism. Moreover, we see the whole fallacy exposed by what the author adds to the sentence already quoted: *Sed illum etiam ADULTORUM baptismum ut sufficientem agnoscunt.* Nevertheless, this author, as if he had perfectly proved his point, concludes, with an air of triumph, that the odious name of *Anabaptists* cannot be given, with any propriety, to the *Mennonites* at this day; *Quare*, says he, *verissimum est, illud odiosum nomen Anabaptistarum illis non convenire.* In this, however, he is certainly mistaken; and the name in question is just as applicable to the modern *Mennonites*, as it was to the sect from which they descend, since the best and wisest of the *Mennonites* maintain, in conformity with the principles of the ancient *Anabaptists*, that the baptism of infants is destitute of validity, and consequently are very careful in re-baptizing their proselytes, notwithstanding their having been baptized, in their tender years, in other Christian churches. Many circumstances persuade me, that the declarations and representations of things given by the modern *Mennonites*, are not always worthy of credit. Unhappily instructed by the miseries and calamities, in which their ancestors were involved, they are anxiously careful to conceal entirely those tenets and laws that are the distinguishing characteristics of their sect; while they embellish what they cannot totally conceal, and disguise with the greatest art such of their institutions, as otherwise might appear of a pernicious tendency, and might expose them to censure.

[f] The writers for and against the *Anabaptists* are amply enumerated by CASPER SAGITARIUS, in his *Introductio ad Hist. Eccles.* tom. i. p. 826. & CHRIST. M. PFAFFIUS, in his

surprizing, when it is considered, that this sect started up, all of a sudden, in several countries at the same point of time, under leaders of different talents and different intentions, and at the very period when the first contests of the Reformers with the Roman pontifs drew the attention of the world, and employed the pens of the learned in such a manner, as to render all other objects and incidents almost matters of indifference. The modern *Mennonites* not only consider themselves as the descendants of the *Waldenses*, who were so grievously oppressed and persecuted by the despotic heads of the Roman church, but pretend, moreover, to be the purest offspring of these respectable sufferers, being equally averse to all principles of rebellion, on the one hand, and all suggestions of fanaticism on the other [g]. Their adversaries, on the contrary, represent them as the descendants of those turbulent and furious *Anabaptists*, who, in the sixteenth century, involved *Germany, Holland, Switzerland*, and more especially the province of *Westphalia*, in such scenes of blood, perplexity, and distress; and alledge, that terrified by the dreadful fate of their associates and also influenced by the moderate counsels and wise injunctions of *MENNON*, they abandoned the ferocity of their primitive enthusiasm, and were gradually brought to a better mind. After having examined these two different accounts of the origine of the *Anabaptists* with the utmost attention and impartiality, I have found that neither of them are exactly conformable to truth.

The most probable account of the origin of the Anabaptists.

II. It may be observed, in the first place, that the *Mennonites* are not entirely mistaken when they boast of their descent from the *Waldenses*, *Petrobrussians*, and other ancient sects, who are usually considered as *witnesses of the truth*, in the times of universal darkness and superstition. Before the rise of *LUTHER* and *CALVIN* there lay concealed, in almost all the countries of *Europe*, particularly in *Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland*, and *Germany*, many persons who adhered tenaciously to the following doctrine which the *Waldenses*, *Wickliffites*, and *Hussites* had maintained, some in a more disguised, and others in a more open and public manner, viz. *That the kingdom of CHRIST, or the visible church he had established upon earth, was an assembly of true and real saints, and ought therefore to be inaccessible to the wicked and unrighteous, and also exempt from all those institutions, which human prudence suggests to oppose the progress of iniquity, or to correct and reform transgressors.*

Introduct. in Histor. Litterar. Theologiæ, part. II. p. 349.—Add to these a modern writer, and a Mennonite preacher, *HERMAN SCHYN*, who published at *Amsterdam* in 8^{vo}. in the year 1729, his *Historia Mennonitar.* and, in 1729, his *Plenior Deductio Hist. Mennonit.* These two books, though they do not deserve the title of a *History of the Mennonites*, are nevertheless useful, in order to come at a thorough knowledge of the affairs of this sect; for this author is much more intent upon defending his brethren against the accusations and reproaches, with which they have been loaded, than careful in tracing out the origin, progress, and revolutions of their sect. And indeed, after all, the *Mennonites* have not much reason to boast either of the extraordinary learning or dexterity of this their patron; nay, it is even to be imagined, that they may easily find a more able defender. For an accurate account of the Mennonite historians, and their confessions of faith, see *JO. CHRIST. KOECHER* *Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolicæ*, p. 461.

[g] See *HERM. SCHYN*, *Plenior Deductio Histor. Mennon.* cap. i. p. 2. as also a Dutch work, entitled, *GALENUS ABRAHAMZON, Verdediging der Christenen, die Doopsgezinde genamd worden*, p. 29.

This

This maxim is the true source of all the peculiarities that are to be found in CENT. XVI. the religious doctrine and discipline of the *Mennonites*; and it is most certain, that the greatest part of these peculiarities were approved of by many of those, who, before the dawn of the reformation, entertained the notion, already mentioned, relating to the visible church of CHRIST [b]. There were, however, different ways of thinking among the different members of this sect with respect to the methods of attaining to such a perfect church-establishment as they had in view. Some, who were of a fanatical complexion on the one hand, and were persuaded, on the other, that such a visible church, as they had modelled out in fancy, could not be realised by the power of man, entertained the pleasing hope, that God, in his own good time, would erect to himself an holy church, exempt from every degree of blemish and impurity, and would set apart, for the execution of this grand design, a certain number of chosen instruments, divinely assisted and prepared for this work by the extraordinary succours of his Holy Spirit. Others, of a more prudent and rational turn of mind, entertained different views of this matter. They neither expected stupendous miracles nor extraordinary revelations; since they were persuaded, that it was possible by human wisdom, industry, and vigilance to purify the church from the contagion of the wicked, and to restore it to the simplicity of its original constitution, provided that the manners and spirit of the primitive Christians could but recover their lost dignity and lustre.

III. The drooping spirits of these people, who had been dispersed through many countries, and persecuted every where with the greatest severity, were revived when they were informed that LUTHER, seconded by several persons of eminent piety, had successfully attempted the reformation of the church. Then they spoke with openness and freedom, and the enthusiasm of the fanatical, as well as the prudence of the wise, discovered themselves in their natural colours. Some of them imagined, that the time was now come in which God himself was to dwell with his servants in an extraordinary manner by celestial succours, and to establish upon earth a kingdom truly spiritual and divine. Others, less sanguine and chimerical in their expectations, flattered themselves, nevertheless, with the fond hopes of the approach of that happy period in which the restoration of the church, which had been so long expected in vain, was to be accomplished, under the divine protection, by the labours and counsels of pious and eminent men. This sect was soon joined by great numbers and (as usually happens in sudden revolutions of this nature) by many persons, whose characters and capacities were very different, though their views seemed to turn upon the same object. Their progress was rapid; for, in a very short space of time, their discourses, visions, and predictions excited commotions in a great part of *Europe*, and drew into their communion a prodigious multitude, whose

[b] See, for an account of the religious sentiments of the *Waldenses*, LIMBORCH's excellent *History of the Inquisition*, translated into English by the learned Dr. SAMUEL CHANDLER, book I. chap. viii.—It appears from undoubted testimonies, that the *Wickliffites* and *Hussites* did not differ extremely from the *Waldenses*, concerning the point under consideration.

CENT. XVI. ignorance rendered them easy victims to the illusions of enthusiasm. It is however to be observed, that as the leaders of this sect had fallen into that erroneous and chimerical notion, that the new kingdom of CHRIST, which they expected, was to be exempt from every kind of vice and from the smallest degree of imperfection and corruption, they were not satisfied with the plan of reformation proposed by LUTHER. They looked upon it as much beneath the sublimity of their views, and, consequently, undertook a more perfect reformation, or, to express more properly their visionary enterprise, they proposed to found a new church, entirely spiritual, and truly divine.

The first motions
of the Anabap-
tists.

IV. It is difficult to determine, with certainty, the particular spot that gave birth to that seditious and pestilential sect of Anabaptists, whose tumults and desperate attempts were equally pernicious to the cause of religion, and the civil interests of mankind. Whether they first arose in *Switzerland*, *Germany*, or the *Netherlands*, is, as yet, a matter of debate, whose decision is of no great importance [i]. It is most probable, that several persons of this odious class made their appearance, at the same time, in different countries; and we may fix this period soon after the dawn of the reformation in *Germany*, when LUTHER arose to set bounds to the ambition of *Rome*. This appears from a variety of circumstances, and especially from this striking one, that the first *Anabaptist* doctors of any eminence, were, almost all, heads and leaders of particular and separate sects. For it must be carefully observed, that though all these projectors of a new, unspotted, and perfect church, were comprehended under the general denomination of *Anabaptists*, on account of their opposing the baptism of infants, and their rebaptizing such as had received that sacrament in a state of childhood in other churches, yet they were from their very origin subdivided into various sects, which differed from each other in points of no small moment. The most pernicious faction, of all those that composed this motley multitude, was that which pretended that the founders of the new and *perfect church*, already mentioned, were under the direction of a divine impulse, and were armed against all opposition by the power of working miracles. It was this detestable faction that, in the year 1521, began their fanatical work under the guidance of MUNZER, STUBNER, STORCK, and other leaders of the same furious complexion, and excited the most unhappy tumults and commotions in *Saxony* and the adjacent countries. They employed at first the various arts of persuasion in order to propagate their doctrine. They preached, exhorted, admonished, and reasoned in a manner that seemed proper to gain the multitude, and related a great number of visions and revelations with which they pretended to have been favoured from above. But when they saw that these methods of making proselytes were not attended with such a rapid success as they fondly expected, and that the ministry of LUTHER and other eminent reformers was detrimental to their cause, they then had re-

[i] FUESLIN has attempted to examine, whether the Anabaptists first arose in *Germany* or *Switzerland*, in a German work, entitled, *Beitrage zur Schweizerisch Reformat. Geschichte*, tom. i. p. 190. tom. ii. p. 64, 65. 265. 327, 328. tom. iii. p. 323. but without success.

course to more expeditious measures, and madly attempted to propagate their fanatical doctrine by force of arms. MUNZER and his associates assembled, in the year 1525, a numerous army, composed, for the most part, of the Peasants of *Suabia, Thuringia, Franconia, and Saxony*, and, at the head of this credulous and deluded rabble, declared war against all laws, government, and magistrates of every kind, under the chimerical pretext that CHRIST was now to take the reins of civil and ecclesiastical government into his own hands, and to rule alone over the nations. But this seditious croud was routed and dispersed, without much difficulty, by the elector of *Saxony* and other princes; MUNZER, their ringleader, ignominiously put to death, and his factious counsellors scattered abroad in different places [k].

V. This bloody defeat of one part of these seditious and turbulent fanatics did not produce that effect upon the rest that might naturally have been expected; it rendered them, indeed, more timorous, but it did not open their eyes upon their delusion. It is certain, that, even after this period, numbers of them, that were infected with the same odious principles, that occasioned the destruction of MUNZER, wandered about in *Germany, Switzerland, and Holland*, and excited the people to rebellion by their seditious discourses. They gathered together congregations in several places, foretold, in consequence of a divine commission, the approaching abolition of magistracy, and the downfall of civil rulers and governors; and, while they pretended to be ambassadors of the most high, insulted, on many occasions, the majesty of heaven by the most flagitious crimes. Those, who distinguished themselves by the enormity of their conduct in this infamous sect, were LEWIS HETZER, BALTHAZAR HUBMEYER, FELIX MENTZ, CONRAD GREBEL, MELCHIOR HOFFMAN, and GEORGE JACOB, who, if their power had seconded their designs, would have involved all *Switzerland, Holland, and Germany* in tumult and blood-shed [l]. A great part of this rabble seemed really delirious; and nothing more extravagant or more incredible can be imagined than the dreams and visions that were constantly arising in their disordered brains. Such of them, as had some sparks of reason left, and had reflexion enough to reduce their notions into a certain form, maintained, among others, the following points of doctrine: That *the church of CHRIST ought to be exempt from all sin—that all things ought to be in common among the faithful—that all usury, tythes, and tribute ought to be entirely abolished—that the baptism of infants was an invention of the devil—that every Christian was invested with a power to preach the Gospel—and consequently, that the church stood in no need of ministers or pastors—that in the kingdom of CHRIST*

The progress of
this sect.

[k] See SECKENDORF, *Histor. Lutheranismi*, lib. i. p. 192. 304. lib. ii. p. 13.—SLEIDAN, *Commentar.* lib. v. p. 47.—JOACH. CAMERARI *Vita Melancthonis*, p. 44.

[l] See JO. BAPT. OTTII *Annales Anabaptist.* p. 21.—JO. HORNBECKII *Summa Controvers.* lib. v. p. 332.—ANTON. MATTHÆI *Analec. veteris ævi*, tom. iv. p. 629. 677. 679.—BERNARD. RAUPACHII *Austriæ Evangel.* tom. ii. p. 41.—JO. GEORG. SCHELHORN, in *Actis ad Histor. Eccles. pertinentibus*, tom. i. p. 100.—GODOFR. ARNOLDI *Historia Hæretica*, lib. xvi. cap. xxi. p. 727.—As also the German work of FUESLIN, entitled, *Beyträgen zu der Schweizer Reform. Geschichte.*

CENT. XVI. civil magistrates were absolutely useless — and that God still continued to reveal his will to chosen persons by dreams and visions [m].

It would betray, however, a strange ignorance, or an unjustifiable partiality, to maintain, that even all those that professed, in general, this absurd doctrine, were chargeable with that furious and brutal extravagance which has been mentioned as the character of too great a part of their sect. This was by no means the case; several of these enthusiasts discovered a milder and more pacific spirit, and were free from any other reproach, than that which resulted from the errors they maintained, and their too ardent desire of spreading them among the multitude. It may still further be affirmed with truth, that many of those, who followed the wiser class of *Anabaptists*, nay, some who adhered to the most extravagant factions of that sect, were men of upright intentions and sincere piety, who were seduced into this mystery of fanaticism and iniquity, by their ignorance and simplicity on the one hand, and by a laudable desire of reforming the corrupt state of religion on the other.

Severe punishments inflicted on the Anabaptists.

VI. The progress of this turbulent sect in almost all the countries of *Europe* alarmed all that had any concern for the public good. Kings, princes, and sovereign states exerted themselves to check these rebellious enthusiasts in their career by issuing out, first, severe edicts to restrain their violence, and employing, at length, capital punishments to conquer their obstinacy [n]. But here a maxim, already verified by repeated experience, received a new degree of confirmation; for the conduct of the *Anabaptists*, under the pressures of persecution, plainly shewed the extreme difficulty of correcting or influencing by the prospect of suffering, or even by the terrors of death, minds that are either deeply tainted with the poison of fanaticism, or firmly bound by the ties of religion. In almost all the countries of *Europe* an unspeakable number of these unhappy wretches preferred death, in its worst forms, to a retractation of their errors. Neither the view of the flames that were kindled to consume them, nor the ignominy of the gibbet, nor the terrors of the sword, could shake their invincible but ill-placed constancy, or make them abandon tenets, that appeared dearer to them than life and all its enjoyments. The *Mennonites* have preserved voluminous records of the lives, actions, and unhappy fate of those of their sect who suffered death for the

[m] This account of the doctrine of the Anabaptists is principally taken from the learned FUESLIN already quoted.

[n] It was in *Saxony*, if I am not mistaken, and also in the year 1525, that penal laws were first enacted against this fanatical tribe. These laws were renewed frequently in the years 1527, 1528, 1534. (See a German work of the learned KAPPIUS, entitled, *Nachlese von Reformations Urkunden*, part. I. p. 176.)—CHARLES V, incensed at the encreasing impudence and iniquity of these Enthusiasts, issued out against them severe edicts in the years 1527 and 1529. (See OTTII *Annales Anabapt.* p. 45.)—The magistrates of *Switzerland* treated, at first, with remarkable lenity and indulgence, the *Anabaptists* that lived under their government; but when it was found that this lenity rendered them still more enterprising and insolent, it was judged proper to have recourse to a different manner of proceeding. Accordingly the magistrates of *Zurich* denounced capital punishment against this riotous sect in the year 1525.

crimes

crimes of rebellion or heresy, which were imputed to them [6]. Certain it is, that they were treated with severity; but it is much to be lamented that so little distinction was made between the members of this sect, when the sword of justice was unsheathed against them. Why were the innocent and the guilty involved in the same fate? why were doctrines purely theological, or, at worst, fanatical, punished with the same rigour that was shewn to crimes inconsistent with the peace and welfare of civil society? Those who had no other marks of peculiarity than their administering baptism to adult persons only, and their excluding the unrighteous from the external communion of the church, ought undoubtedly to have met with milder treatment than what was given to those seditious incendiaries, who were for unhinging all government and destroying all civil authority! Many suffered for errors they had embraced with the most upright intentions, seduced by the eloquence and fervor of their doctors, and persuading themselves that they were contributing to the advancement of true religion. But as the greatest part of these enthusiasts had communicated to the multitude their visionary notions concerning the new spiritual kingdom that was soon to be erected, and the abolition of magistracy and civil government that was to be the immediate effect of this great revolution, this rendered the very name of *Anabaptist* unspeakably odious, and made it always excite the idea of a seditious incendiary, a pest to human society. It is true, indeed, that many *Anabaptists* suffered death, not on account of their being considered as rebellious subjects, but merely because they were judged to be *incurable Heretics*; for in this century the error of limiting the administration of baptism to adult persons only, and the practice of rebaptizing such as had received that sacrament in a state of infancy, were looked upon as most flagitious and intolerable heresies. It is, nevertheless, certain, that the greatest part of these wretched sufferers owed their unhappy fate to their rebellious principles and tumultuous proceedings, and that many also were punished for their temerity, and imprudence, which led them to the commission of various crimes.

VII. There stands upon record a most shocking instance of this in the dreadful commotions that were excited at *Munster* in the year 1533, by certain Dutch Anabaptists, that chose that city as the scene of their horrid operations, and committed in it such deeds, as would surpass all credibility, were they not attested in a manner that excludes every degree of doubt and uncertainty. A handful of madmen, who had got into their heads the visionary notion of a new and spiritual kingdom, soon to be established in an extraordinary manner, formed themselves into a society under the guidance of a few illiterate leaders chosen out of the populace. And they persuaded, not only the ignorant multitude, but even several among the learned, that *Munster* was to be the seat of this new and heavenly *Jerusalem*, whose ghostly dominion was to be propagated from thence to all the ends of the earth. The ringleaders of this furious tribe were JOHN MATTHISON, JOHN

The Anabaptists
of *Munster*.

[6] See JOACH. CHRIST. JEHRING, *Præfat. ad Historiam Mennonitarum*, p. 3.

CENT. XVI. BOCKHOLD, a taylor of *Leyden*, one GERHARD, with some others, whom the blind rage of enthusiasm, or the still more culpable principles of sedition had embarked in this extravagant and desperate cause. They made themselves masters of the city of *Munster*, deposed the magistrates, and committed all the enormous crimes and ridiculous follies, which the most perverse and infernal imagination could suggest [p]. JOHN BOCKHOLD was proclaimed king and legislator of this new Hierarchy; but his reign was transitory, and his end deplorable. For the city of *Munster*, was, in the year 1536, retaken, after a long siege, by its bishop and sovereign Count WALDECK, the *New Jerusalem* of the Anabaptists destroyed, and its mock-monarch punished with a most painful and ignominious death [q]. The disorders occasioned by the Anabaptists, at this period, not only in *Westphalia*, but also in other places [r], shewed too plainly to what horrid lengths the pernicious doctrines of this wrong-headed sect were adapted to

[(p)] BOCKHOLDT, or BOCKELSON, alias JOHN of *Leyden*, who headed them at *Munster*, ran stark naked in the streets, married eleven wives, at the same time, to shew his approbation of polygamy, entitled himself king of *Sion*; all which was but a very small part of the pernicious follies of this mock-monarch.]

[q] See ANTON. CORVINI *Narratio de miserabili Monaster. Anabapt. excidio*, published first at *Wittenberg* in the year 1536.—CASP. SAGITTAR. *Introduct. in Hist. Ecclesiast.* tom. i. p. 537 & 835.—HERM. HAMELMANN. *Historia Renati Evangelii in Urbe Monaster. in Operib. Genealogico-Historicis*, p. 1203.—The elegant Latin Poem of BOLANDUS in Elegiac verse, entitled, JO. FABRICII BOLANDI *Motus Monasteriens. Libri Decem*, *Colan*, 1546, in 8 o.—HERM. KERSEN-BROCK, *Histor. Belli Monaster.*—DAN. GERDES, *Miscellan. Groningens. Nov.* tom. ii. p. 377. This latter author speaks also of BERNARD ROTHMAN, an ecclesiastic of *Munster*, who had introduced the Reformation into that city, but afterwards was infected with the Enthusiasm of the Anabaptists; and, though in other respects he had shewn himself to be neither destitute of learning nor virtue, yet enlisted himself in this fanatical tribe, and had a share in their most turbulent and furious proceedings.

[(r)] The scenes of violence, tumult, and sedition, that were exhibited in *Holland* by this odious tribe, were also terrible. They formed the design of reducing the city of *Leyden* to ashes, but were happily prevented and severely punished. JOHN of *Leyden*, the anabaptist king of *Munster*, had taken it into his head that God had made him a present of the cities of *Amsterdam*, *Deventer*, and *Wesel*; in consequence thereof he sent bishops to these three places to preach his gospel of sedition and carnage. About the beginning of the year 1535, twelve anabaptists, of whom five were women, assembled at midnight in a private house at *Amsterdam*. One of them, who was a taylor by profession, fell into a trance, and after having preached and prayed during the space of four hours, stripped himself naked, threw his cloaths into the fire, and commanded all the assembly to do the same, in which he was obeyed without the least reluctance. He then ordered them to follow him through the streets in this state of nature, which they accordingly did howling, and bawling out, *Woe! woe! the wrath of God! the wrath of God! woe! to Babylon!* When, after being seized and brought before the magistrates, cloaths were offered them to cover their indecency, they refused them obstinately, and cried aloud, *We are the naked truth*. When they were brought to the scaffold they sung and danced, and discovered all the marks of enthusiastic frenzy.—These tumults were followed by a regular and deep-laid conspiracy formed by VAN GEELLEN (an envoy of the mock king of *Munster*, who had made a very considerable number of proselytes) against the magistrates of *Amsterdam*, with a design to wrest the government of that city out of their hands. This incendiary marched his fanatical troop to the town-house on the day appointed, drums beating, and colours flying, and fixed there his head-quarters. He was attacked by the burghers, assisted by some regular troops, and headed by several of the burgomasters of the city. After an obstinate resistance he was surrounded, with his whole troop, who were put to death in the severest and most dreadful manner to serve as examples to the other branches of the sect, who were exciting commotions of a like nature in *Friesland*, *Groningen*, and other provinces and cities in the *Netherlands*.]

lead the inconsiderate and unwary; and therefore it is not at all to be wondered, that the secular arm employed rigorous measures to extirpate a faction, which was the occasion, nay the source, of unspeakable calamities in so many countries [s].

VIII. While the terrors of death, in the most dreadful forms, were presented to the view of this miserable sect, and numbers of them were executed every day without a proper distinction being made between the innocent and the guilty, those, that escaped the severity of justice, were in the most discouraging situation that can well be imagined. On the one hand, they beheld, with sorrow, all their hopes blasted by the total defeat of their brethren at *Munster*; and on the other, they were filled with the most anxious apprehensions of the perils, that threatened them on all sides. In this critical situation they derived much comfort and assistance from the counsels and zeal of MENNO SIMON, a native of *Friesland*, who had formerly been a popish priest, and, as he himself confesses, a notorious profligate. This man went over to the Anabaptists, at first, in a clandestine manner, and frequented their assemblies with the utmost secrecy; but, in the year 1536, he threw off the mask, resigned his rank and office in the Romish church, and publicly embraced their communion. About a year after this he was earnestly solicited by many of the sect to assume, among them, the rank and functions of a public teacher; and as he looked upon the persons, from whom this proposal came, to be exempt from the fanatical frenzy of their brethren at *Munster* (though, according to other accounts, they were originally of the same stamp, only rendered somewhat wiser by their sufferings) he yielded to their entreaties. From this period to the end of his days, that is, during the space of twenty-five years, he travelled from one country to another with his wife and children, exercising his ministry under pressures and calamities of various kinds that succeeded each other without interruption, and constantly exposed to the danger of falling a victim to the severity of the laws. *East and West-Friesland*, together with the province of *Groningen*, were first visited by this zealous apostle of the Anabaptists; from thence he directed his course into *Holland*, *Gelderland*, *Brabant*, and *West-phalia*, continued it through the German provinces that lie on the coasts of the *Baltick* sea, and penetrated so far as *Livonia*. In all these places his ministerial labours were attended with remarkable success, and added to his sect a prodigious number of proselytes. Hence he is deservedly looked upon as the common chief of almost all the Anabaptists, and the parent of the sect that still subsists under that denomination. The success of this missionary will not appear very surprizing to those, who are acquainted with his character, spirit, and talents, and who have a just notion of the state of the Anabaptists at the period of time now under consideration. MENNO was a man of genius; though, as his writings shew, his genius was not under the direction of a very sound judgment. He had the inestimable advantage of a natural and persuasive eloquence, and his learning was sufficient to make him pass for an oracle in the eyes of the multitude. He appears, moreover,

[s] GER. BRANDT, *Histor. Reform. Belgicæ*, tom. i. lib. ii. p. 119,

CENT. XVI. to have been a man of probity, of a meek and tractable spirit, gentle in his manners, pliable and obsequious in his commerce with persons of all ranks and characters, and extremely zealous in promoting practical religion and virtue, which he recommended by his example, as well as by his precepts. A man of such talents and dispositions could not fail to attract the admiration of the people, and to gain a great number of adherents wherever he exercised his ministry. But no where could he expect a more plentiful harvest than among the *Anabaptists*, whose ignorance and simplicity rendered them peculiarly susceptible of new impressions, and who, having been long accustomed to leaders that resembled frenetick bacchanals more than Christian ministers, and often deluded by odious impostors, who involved them in endless perils and calamities, were rejoiced to find at length a teacher, whose doctrine and manners seemed to promise them more prosperous days [t].

His doctrine.

IX. MENNO drew up a plan of doctrine and discipline of a much more mild and moderate nature than that of the furious and fanatical Anabaptists already mentioned, but somewhat more severe, though more clear and consistent, than the doctrine of some of the wiser branches of that sect, who aimed at nothing more than restoration of the Christian church to its primitive purity. Accordingly, he condemned the plan of ecclesiastical discipline, that was founded on the prospect of a new kingdom, to be miraculously established by JESUS CHRIST on the ruins of civil government and the destruction of human rulers, and which had been the fatal and pestilential source of such dreadful commotions, such execrable rebellions, and such enormous crimes. He declared, publicly, his dislike of that doctrine, which pointed out the approach of a marvellous reformation in the church by the means of a new and *extraordinary* effusion of the Holy Spirit. He expressed his abhorrence of the licentious tenets, which several of the Anabaptists had maintained with respect to the lawfulness of polygamy and divorce; and, finally, considered as unworthy of toleration those fanatics, who were of opinion that the Holy Ghost continued to descend into the minds of many chosen believers in as extraordinary a manner, as he did at the first establishment of the Christian church, and that he testified this peculiar presence to several of the faithful by miracles, predictions, dreams, and visions of various kinds. He retained, indeed, the doctrines commonly received among the Anabaptists in relation to the baptism of infants, the

[t] MENNO was born at *Witmarsum*, a village in the neighbourhood of *Bolswert* in *Friesland*, in the year 1505, and not in 1496, as most writers tell us. After a life of toil, peril, and agitation, he departed in peace in the year 1561, in the duchy of *Holslein*, at the country seat of a certain nobleman, not far from the city of *Oldesloe*, who, moved with compassion at a view of the perils to which MENNO was exposed, and the snares that were daily laid for his ruin, took him, together with certain of his associates, into his protection, and gave him an asylum. We have a particular account of this famous Anabaptist in the *Cimbria Litterata* of MOLLERUS, tom. ii. p. 835. See also HERM. SCHYN, *Plenior Deduct. Hist. Mennon.* cap. vi. p. 116. — The writings of MENNO, which are almost all composed in the Dutch language, were published in folio at *Amsterdam*, in the year 1651. An excessively diffuse and rambling style, frequent and unnecessary repetitions, an irregular and confused method, with other defects of equal moment, render the perusal of these productions highly disagreeable.

Millennium,

Millennium, or thousand years reign of CHRIST upon earth, the exclusion of magistrates from the Christian church, the abolition of war, and the prohibition of oaths enjoined by our Saviour, and the vanity, as well as the pernicious effects of human science. But while MENNO retained these doctrines in a general sense, he explained and modified them in such a manner, as made them resemble the religious tenets that were universally received in the protestant churches; and this rendered them agreeable to many, and made them appear inoffensive even to numbers, who had no inclination to embrace them. It however so happened, that the nature of the doctrines, considered in themselves, the eloquence of MENNO, which set them off to such advantage, and the circumstances of the times, gave a high degree of credit to the religious system of this famous teacher among the Anabaptists, so that it made a rapid progress in that sect. And thus it was in consequence of the ministry of MENNO, that the different sorts of Anabaptists agreed together in excluding from their communion the fanatics that dishonoured it, and in renouncing all tenets that were detrimental to the authority of civil government, and, by an unexpected coalition, formed themselves into one community [u].

[u] These facts shew us plainly how the famous question concerning the origin of the modern Anabaptists may be resolved. The Mennonites oppose, with all their might, the account of their descent from the ancient Anabaptists, which we find in so many writers, and would willingly give the modern Anabaptists a more honourable origin. (See SCHYN, *Hist. Mennonitar.* cap. viii, ix. xxi. p. 223.) The reason of their zeal in this matter is evident. Their situation has rendered them timorous. They live, as it were, in the midst of their enemies, and are constantly filled with an uneasy apprehension, that, some day or other, malevolent zealots may take occasion from their supposed origin to renew against them the penal laws by which the seditious Anabaptists of ancient times suffered in such a dreadful manner. At least, they imagine that the *odium*, under which they lie, will be greatly diminished, if they can prove, to the satisfaction of the publick, the falsehood of that generally received opinion, that the *Mennonites are the descendants of the Anabaptists, or, to speak more properly, the same individual sect, purged from the fanaticism that formerly disgraced it, and rendered wiser than their ancestors, by reflexion and suffering.*

After comparing diligently and impartially together what has been alledged by the Mennonites and their adversaries in relation to this matter, I cannot see what it is, properly, that forms the subject of their controversy; and, if the merits of the cause be stated with accuracy and perspicuity, I don't see how there can be any dispute at all about the matter now under consideration: For in the

First place, if the Mennonites mean nothing more than this: that MENNO, whom they consider as their parent and their chief, was not infected with those odious opinions which drew the just severity of the laws upon the Anabaptists of *Munster*, that he neither looked for a new and ipotless kingdom that was to be miraculously erected on earth, nor excited the multitude to depose magistrates and abolish civil government; that he neither deceived himself, nor imposed upon others, by fanatical pretensions to dreams and visions of a supernatural kind; if (I say) this be all that the Mennonites mean, when they speak of their chief, no person, acquainted with the history of their sect, will pretend to contradict them. Nay, even those, who maintain that there was an immediate and intimate connexion between the ancient and modern Anabaptists, will readily allow to be true all that has been here said of MENNO.—2dly, If the Anabaptists maintain, that such of their churches as received their doctrine and discipline from MENNO, have not only discovered without interruption a pacific spirit and an unlimited submission to civil government (abstaining from every thing that carried the remotest aspect of sedition, and shewing the utmost abhorrence of wars and bloodshed) but have even banished from their *confessions* of faith and their religious instructions, all those tenets and principles that led on the ancient Anabaptists to disobedience, violence, and rebellion; all this again, will be readily granted.—And, if they alledge in the third place, that even the Anabaptists, who lived before MENNO, were not *all* so delirious as MUNZER,

The origin of
the sects that
have started up
among the Ana-
baptists.

X. To preserve a spirit of union and concord in a body, composed of such a motley multitude of dissonant members, required more than human power, and MENNO neither had, nor pretended to have supernatural succours. Accordingly, the seeds of dissension were, in a little time, sown among this people. About the middle of this century a warm contest, concerning *Excommunication*, was excited by several Anabaptists, headed by LEONARD BOUWENSON and THEODORE PHILIP; and its fruits are yet visible in that divided sect. These men carried the discipline of excommunication to an enormous degree of severity and rigour. They not only maintained, that open transgressors, even those who sincerely deplored and lamented their faults, should, without any previous warning or admonition, be expelled from the communion of the church, but were also audacious enough to pretend to exclude the persons, thus excommunicated, from all intercourse with their wives, husbands, brothers, sisters, children, and relations. The same persons, as might naturally be expected from this sample of their severity, were harsh and rigid in their manners, and were for imposing upon their brethren a course of moral discipline which was difficult and austere in

nor so outrageous as the fanatical part of that sect, that rendered their memory eternally odious by the enormities they committed at *Munster*; that, on the contrary, many of these ancient Anabaptists abstained religiously from all acts of violence and sedition, followed the pious examples of the ancient Waldenses, Henricians, Petrobrussians, Hussites, and Wickliffites, and adopted the doctrine and discipline of MENNO, as soon as that new parent arose to reform and patronise the sect; all this will be allowed without hesitation.

But, on the other hand, the Mennonites may assert many things in defence of the purity of their origin, which cannot be admitted by any person who is free from prejudice, and well acquainted with their history. If they maintain, 1st, that none of their sect descended by birth from those Anabaptists, who involved *Germany* and other countries in the most dreadful calamities, or, that none of these furious fanatics adopted the doctrine and discipline of MENNO, they may be easily refuted by a great number of facts and testimonies, and, particularly, by the declarations of MENNO himself, who glories in his having conquered the ferocity, and reformed the lives and errors of several members of this pestilential sect. Nothing can be more certain than this fact, viz. that the first Mennonite congregations were composed of the different sorts of Anabaptists already mentioned, of those, who had been always inoffensive and upright, and of those, who before their conversion by the ministry of MENNO, had been seditious fanatics. Nor can the acknowledgement of this incontestable fact be a just matter of reproach to the Mennonites, or be more dishonourable to them, than it is to us, that our ancestors were warmly attached to the idolatrous and extravagant worship of paganism or popery.—Again; it will not be possible for us to agree with the *Mennonites*, if they maintain, 2^{dly}, that their sect does not retain, at this day, any of those tenets, or even any remains of those opinions and doctrines, which led the seditious and turbulent Anabaptists of old, to the commission of so many and of such enormous crimes. For not to mention MENNO's calling the Anabaptists of *Munster* his *Brethren* (a denomination indeed somewhat softened by the epithet of *erring*, which he joined to it) it is undoubtedly true, that the doctrine concerning the nature of *Christ's Kingdom*, or the *Church of the New Testament*, which led, by degrees, the ancient Anabaptists to those furious acts of rebellion that have rendered them so odious, is by no means effaced in the minds of the modern Mennonites. It is, indeed, weakened and modified in such a manner as to have lost its noxious qualities, and to be no longer pernicious in its influence; but it is not totally renounced nor abolished.—I shall not now inquire how far even the reformed and milder sect of MENNO has been, in time past, exempt from tumults and commotions of a grievous kind, nor shall I examine what passes at this day among the Anabaptists in general, or in particular branches of that sect; since it is certain, that the more eminent communities of that denomination, particularly those that flourish in *North-Holland*, and the places adjacent, behold fanatics with the utmost aversion, as appears evidently from this circumstance, among others, that they will not suffer the people called *Quakers* to enter into their communion.

the highest degree. Many of the Anabaptists protested against this, as unreasonable and unnecessary; and thus the community was, all of a sudden, divided into two sects; of which the one treated transgressors with lenity and moderation, while the other proceeded against them with the utmost rigour. Nor was this the only difference that was observable in the conduct and manners of these two parties; since the latter was remarkable for the sordid austerity that reigned in their rules of life and practice; while the former, considering, more wisely, the present state of human nature, were less severe in their injunctions, and were not altogether regardless of what is called decent, agreeable and ornamental in life and manners. MENNO employed his most vigorous efforts to heal these divisions, and to restore peace and concord in the community; but when he perceived that his attempts were vain, he conducted himself in such a manner, as he thought the most proper to maintain his credit and influence among both parties. For this purpose he declared himself for neither side, but was constantly trimming between the two, as long as he lived; at one time discovering an inclination towards the austere Anabaptists; and, at another, seeming to prefer the milder discipline and manners of the more moderate brethren. But in this he acted in opposition to the plainest dictates of prudence; and accordingly the high degree of authority, he enjoyed, rendered his inconstancy and irresolution not only disagreeable to both parties, but also the means of enflaming instead of healing their divisions [w].

XI. These two sects are to this very day distinguished by the denominations of *fine* and *gross* [x], or, to express the distinction in more intelligible terms, into *rigid* and *moderate* Anabaptists. The former observe with the most religious accuracy, veneration, and precision, the ancient doctrine, discipline, and precepts of the purer sort of Anabaptists; the latter depart much more from the primitive sentiments, manners, and institutions of their sect, and approach nearer to those of the protestant churches. The *gross* or *moderate* Anabaptists consisted, at first, of the inhabitants of a district in *North-Holland*, called *Waterland*; and hence their whole sect was distinguished by the denomination of *Waterlandians* [y]. The *fine* or *rigid* part of that com-

The rigid and moderate Anabaptists.

[w] See the *Historia Bellorum et Certaminum quæ ab A. 1615, inter Mennonitas contigerunt*, which was published by an anonymous Mennonite.—See also a German Work, entitled, SIM. FRED. RUEB, *Nachrichten von dem Zustande der Mennoniten*, published in 8^{vo} at *Jena*, in the year 1743.

[x] The terms *fine* and *gross* are a literal translation of *groben* and *feinen*, which are the German denominations used to distinguish these two sects. The same terms have been introduced among the Protestants in *Holland*; the *fine* denoting a set of people, whose extraordinary, and, sometimes fanatical, devotion resembles that of the English Methodists; while the *gross* is applied to the generality of Christians, who make no extraordinary pretensions to uncommon degrees of sanctity and devotion.]

[y] See FRID. SPANHEMII *Elenchus Controvers. Theol. Opp.* tom. iii. p. 772. The *Waterlandians* were also called *Johannites* from JOHN DE RIES, who was of great use to them in many respects, and who, assisted by LUBBERT GERARD, composed their confession of faith in the year 1580. This confession (which far surpasses both in point of simplicity and wisdom all the other confessions of the Mennonites) has passed through several editions, and has been lately re-published by HERMAN SCHYN, in his *Histor. Mennon.* cap. vii. p. 172. It was also illustrated in an ample Commentary, in the year 1686, by PETER JOANNIS, a native of *Holland*, and pastor among the *Waterlandians*. It has, however, been alledged, that this famous production is, by no means, the general confession of the *Waterlandians*, but the private one only of that particular congregation, of which its author was the pastor. See RUEB, *Nachrichten*, p. 93, 94.

munity

CENT. XVI.

munity were, for the most part, natives of *Flanders*; and hence their sect acquired the denomination of *Flemingians*, or *Flandrians*. But new dissensions and contests arose among these *rigid* Anabaptists, not, indeed, concerning any point of doctrine, but about the manner of treating persons, that were to be excommunicated, and other matters of inferior moment. Hence a new schism arose, and they were subdivided into two sects, distinguished by the appellations of *Flandrians* and *Frieslanders*, who differed from each other in their manners and discipline. To these were added a third, who took the name of their country, like the two former, and were called *Germans*; for the Anabaptists of *Germany* passed, in shoals, into *Holland* and the *Netherlands*. But in process of time the greatest part of these three sects came over, by degrees, to the moderate community of the *Waterlandians*, with whom they lived in the strictest bonds of peace and union. Those among the rigid Anabaptists, who refused to follow this example of moderation, are still known by the denomination of the *Old Flemingians*, or *Flandrians*, but are few in number, when compared with the united congregations of the milder sects now mentioned.

The source from which the Mennonites drew their doctrine.

XII. No sooner were the workings of enthusiasm suppressed among the Mennonites, than all the different sects, into which they had been divided, unanimously agreed to draw the whole system of their religious doctrine from the Holy Scriptures alone. To give a satisfactory proof of the sincerity of their resolution in this respect, they took care to have *Confessions* drawn up, in which their sentiments concerning the Deity, and the manner of serving him were expressed in the terms and phrases of Holy writ. The most ancient, and also the most respectable of these *Confessions*, is that which we find among the *Waterlandians*. Several others, of later date, were also composed, some for the use of large communities, for the people of a whole district, and which were consequently submitted to the inspection of the magistrate; others designed only for the benefit of private societies [z]. It might not, perhaps, be amiss to inquire, whether all the tenets, received among the Mennonites, are faithfully exhibited, and plainly expressed in these *Confessions*, or whether several points be not there omitted, which relate to the internal constitution of this sect, and would give us a compleat idea of its nature and tendency. One thing is certain, that whoever peruses these *Confessions* with an ordinary degree of attention, will easily perceive, that those tenets, which appear detrimental to the interests of civil society, particularly those that relate to the prerogatives of magistracy and the admini-

[z] See an account of these *Confessions* in SCHYN's *Plenier Deduct. Hist. Mennon.* cap. iv. p. 78. 115. where he maintains, that *these Confessions prove as great a uniformity among the Mennonites in relation to the great and fundamental doctrines of religion, as can be pretended to, by any other Christian community.* But should the good man even succeed in persuading us of this boasted uniformity, he will yet never be able to make his assertion go down with many of his own brethren, who are, to this day, quarrelling about several points of religion, and who look upon matters, which appear to him of little consequence, as of high moment and importance to the cause of true piety. And, indeed, how could any of the Mennonites, before this present century, believe what SCHYN here affirms, since it is well known, that they disputed about matters which he treats with contempt, as if they had been immediately connected with their eternal interests.

stration of oaths, are expressed with the utmost caution, and embellished with the greatest art, to prevent their bearing an alarming aspect. At the same time the more discerning observer will see, that these embellishments are intended to disguise the truth, and that the doctrine of the Anabaptists, concerning the critical points abovementioned, are not represented in their public *Confessions* in their real colours.

XIII. The ancient Anabaptists, who presumptuously trusted in an extraordinary direction of the Holy Spirit, were (under the pretended influence of so infallible a guide) little solicitous about composing a system of religion, and never once thought of instilling into the minds of the people just sentiments of the Deity. Hence the warm dissensions that arose among them concerning matters of the highest consequence, such as the *Divinity of CHRIST*, *Polygamy*, and *Divorce*. MENNO and his disciples made some attempts to supply this defect. But nevertheless we find, after his time, that the Mennonites, more especially those of the *rigid* class, carried the freedom of their religious speculations to such an excessive height, as bordered upon extravagance. This circumstance alone, were there no other, proves that the heads of this sect employed the smallest part of their zeal to prevent the introduction and propagation of error; and that they looked upon sanctity of life and manners alone, as the essence of true religion. The *Waterlandians* indeed, and after them the other Anabaptists, were obliged, at length, to draw up a summary of their doctrine, and to lay it before the public, in order to remove the *odium* that was cast upon them on account of their bold tenets, and their extravagant disputes, which were likely to involve them in the greatest calamities. But these *Confessions* of the *Mennonites*, were, in reality, little more than a method of defence to which they were reduced by the opposition they met with, and must therefore be rather considered as an expedient to avert the indignation of their enemies, than as articles of doctrine, which all of them, without exception, were obliged to believe. For we do not find among the Mennonites (a part of the modern *Waterlandians* excepted) any injunction, which expressly prohibited individuals from entertaining or propagating religious opinions different from the public creed of the community. And, indeed, when we look attentively into the nature and constitution of this sect, it will appear to have been, in some measure, founded upon this principle, that practical piety is the essence of religion, and that the surest and most infallible mark of the *true church*, is the sanctity of its members; it is at least certain, that this *principle* was always, universally, adopted by the Anabaptists.

Their religion was late reduced into a system.

XIV. If we are to form our judgment of the religion of the *Mennonites* from their public creeds and confessions, we shall find, that though it varies widely from the doctrine of the Lutherans, yet, in most things, it differs but little from that of the Reformed church. They consider the sacraments in no other light, than as *signs* or symbols of the spiritual blessings administered in the Gospel; and their ecclesiastical discipline seems to be almost entirely the same with that of the *Presbyterians*. There are, however, peculiar tenets by which they are distinguished from all other religious communities,

The religion of the Mennonites.

CENT. XVI. and these may be reduced under three heads. For it is observable, that there are certain doctrines which are held in common by all the various sects of the Mennonites: others which are only received in some of the more eminent and numerous sects of that community: (such were the sentiments of MENNO, which hindered him from being universally acceptable to the Anabaptists:) and others, again, which are only to be found among the more obscure and inconsiderable societies of that denomination. These last, indeed, appear and vanish with the transitory sects that adopt them, and therefore do not deserve to employ our attention any farther, in this place.

The great principle on which the general doctrine of the Mennonites is founded.

XV. The opinions that are held in common by the Mennonites, seem to be all derived from this leading and fundamental principle, that *the kingdom which CHRIST established upon earth is a visible church or community, into which the holy and the just are alone to be admitted, and which is consequently, exempt from all those institutions and rules of discipline, that have been invented by human wisdom for the correction and reformation of the wicked.*

This fanatical principle was frankly avowed by the ancient Mennonites: their more immediate descendants, however, began to be less ingenuous, and, in their public *Confessions of faith*, they either disguised it under ambiguous phrases, or expressed themselves as if they meant to renounce it entirely. To renounce it, entirely, was impossible, without falling into the greatest inconsistency, and undermining the very foundation of those doctrines that distinguished them from all other Christian societies [a]. And yet it is certain, that the present Mennonites, as they have, in many other respects, departed from the principles and maxims of their ancestors; so have they given a striking instance of defection in the case now before us, and have almost wholly renounced this fundamental doctrine of their sect relating to the nature of the Christian church. A dismal experience has convinced them of the absurdity of this chimerical principle, which the dictates of reason and the declarations of scripture had demonstrated sufficiently, but without effect. Now that the Mennonites have opened their eyes, they seem to be pretty generally agreed about the following tenets; *First*, that there is an *invisible* church which is universal in its extent, and is composed

[a] That they did not renounce it entirely is evident from their own *Creds and Confessions*, even from those, in which the greatest caution has been employed to conceal the principles, that rendered their ancestors odious, and to disguise whatever might render themselves liable to suspicion. For example, they speak, in the most pompous terms, concerning the dignity, excellence, utility, and divine origin of civil magistrates; and I am willing to suppose that they speak their real sentiments in this matter. But when they proceed to give reasons that prevent their admitting magistrates into their communion, they discover unwarily the very principles, which they are otherwise so studious to conceal. Thus, in the thirtieth article of the Waterlandian Confession, they declare, that *Jesus Christ has not comprehended the institution of civil magistracy in his spiritual kingdom, in the church of the New Testament, nor has he added it to the offices of his church: the Latin words are: Potestatem hanc politicam Dominus Jesus in regno suo spirituali, ecclesia Novi Testamenti, non instituit neque hanc officiis ecclesiae suae adjunxit.* Hence it appears, that the Mennonites look upon the church of the New Testament as a holy republic inaccessible to the wicked, and, consequently, exempt from those institutions and laws, that are necessary to oppose the progress of iniquity. Why then do they not speak plainly, when they deliver their doctrine concerning the nature of the church, instead of affecting ambiguity and evasions?

of members from all the sects and communities that bear the Christian name: *Secondly*, that the mark of the true church is not, as their former doctrine supposed, to be sought for in the unspotted sanctity of all its members (since they acknowledge that the visible church is promiscuously composed of the righteous and the wicked) but in the knowledge of the truth, as it was delivered by CHRIST, and in the agreement of all the members of the church in professing and defending it.

XVI. Notwithstanding all this, it is manifest, beyond all possibility of contradiction, that the religious opinions, which still distinguish the Mennonites from all other Christian communities, flow directly from the ancient doctrine of the Anabaptists concerning the nature of the church. It is in consequence of this doctrine, that *they admit none to the sacrament of baptism, but persons that are come to the full use of their reason*; because infants are incapable of binding themselves by a solemn vow to a holy life, and it is altogether uncertain whether or no, in maturer years, they will be saints or sinners: It is in consequence of the same doctrine, that *they neither admit civil rulers into their communion, nor allow any of their members to perform the functions of magistracy*; for where there are no malefactors, magistrates are useless. Hence do they pretend also *to deny the lawfulness of repelling force by force, and consider war, in all its shapes, as unchristian and unjust*; for as those, who are *perfectly holy*, can neither be provoked by injuries, nor commit them, they don't stand in need of the force of arms, either for the purposes of resentment or defence. It is still the same principle that excites in them *the utmost aversion to the execution of justice, and more especially to capital punishments*; since, according to this principle, there are no transgressions nor crimes in the kingdom of CHRIST, and consequently no occasion for the arm of the judge. Nor can it be imagined, that *they should refuse to confirm their testimony by an oath* upon any other foundation than this, that the *perfect members of a holy church* can neither *dissemble* nor *deceive*. It was certainly then, the ancient doctrine of the Anabaptists concerning the sanctity of the church that gave rise to the tenets now mentioned, and that was the source of that rigid and severe discipline, which excited such tumults and divisions among the members of that community.

XVII. The rules of moral discipline, that were formerly observed by the Mennonites, were rigorous and austere in the highest degree, and this every way conformable to the fundamental principle, which has been already mentioned as the source of all their peculiar tenets. It is somewhat doubtful whether these rules still subsist and are respected among them; but it is certain, that in the times of old their moral precepts were very severe. And indeed it could not well be otherwise; for when these people had once got it into their heads, that *sanctity of manners* was the *only* genuine mark of the true church, it may well be imagined, that they would spare no pains to obtain this honourable character for their sect, and that, for this purpose, they would use the strictest precautions to guard their brethren against disgracing their profession by immoral practices. Hence it was, that they

Their peculiar
tenets or doc-
trines.

Their system of
morality.

CENT. XVI. unanimously and, no doubt, justly exalted the rules of the Gospel on account of their transcendent purity. They alledged, that CHRIST had promulgated a new law of life far more perfect than that which had been delivered by MOSES and the Prophets, and they excluded from their communion all such as deviated, in the least, from the most rigorous rules of simplicity and gravity in their looks, their gestures, their cloathing, and their table: all, whose desires surpassed the dictates of mere necessity: nay even all, who observed a certain decorum in their manners, and paid a decent regard to the innocent customs of the world. But this primitive austerity is greatly diminished in the more considerable sects of the Mennonites, and more especially among the Waterlandians and Germans. The opulence they have acquired by their industry and commerce has relaxed their severity, softened their manners, and rendered them less insensible of the sweets of life; so that, at this day, the Mennonite congregations furnish their pastors with as much matter of censure and admonition as any other Christian community [b]. There are, however, still some remains of the abstinence and severity of manners that prevailed formerly among the Anabaptists; but these are only to be found among some of the smaller sects of that persuasion, and, more particularly, among those who live remote from great and populous cities.

The singular tenets of some sects.

XVIII. The particular sentiments and opinions that divided the more considerable societies of the Mennonites, were those that follow: I. MENNO denied that CHRIST derived from his mother the body he assumed, and thought, on the contrary, that it was produced out of nothing, in the womb of that blessed Virgin; by the *creating* power of the Holy Ghost [c]. This opinion is yet firmly maintained by the *ancient Flamingians*, or *rigid* Anabaptists; but has, long since, been renounced by all the other sects of that deno-

[(b) It is certain, that the Mennonites in *Holland*, at this day, are in their tables, their equipages and their country-seats the most luxurious part of the Dutch nation. This is more especially true of the Mennonites of *Amsterdam*, who are very numerous and extremely opulent.]

[c] This is the account that is given of the opinion of MENNO by HERMAN SCHYN, in his *Plenior Deduct. Hist. Mennonit.* p. 164, 165. which other writers represent in a different manner. After an attentive perusal of several passages in the writings of MENNO, where he professedly handles this very subject, it appears to me more than probable, that he inclined to the opinion attributed to him in the text, and that it was in this sense only, that he supposed CHRIST to be cloathed with a *divine* and *celestial* body. For that may, without any impropriety, be called *celestial* and *divine*, which is produced immediately, in consequence of a *creating* act, by the Holy Ghost. It must however be acknowledged, that MENNO does not seem to have been unchangeably wedded to this opinion. For in several places he expresses himself ambiguously on this head, and even sometimes falls into inconsistencies. From hence, perhaps, it might not be unreasonable to conclude, that he renounced, indeed, the common opinion concerning the origin of CHRIST's human nature; but was pretty much undetermined with respect to the hypothesis, which, among many that were proposed, it was proper to substitute in its place. See FUESLINI *Centuria I Epistolar. a Reformatore Helveticis scriptar.* p. 383.—Be that as it may, MENNO is generally considered as the author of this opinion concerning the origin of CHRIST's body, which is still embraced by the more rigid part of his followers. It appears probable, nevertheless, that this opinion was much older than his time, and was only adopted by him with the other tenets of the Anabaptists. As a proof of this it may be observed, that BOLANDUS, in his Poem, entitled, *Motus Monasteriensis*, mination.

mination [d]. II. The more austere Mennonites, like their forefathers, not only animadvert, with the most unrelenting severity, upon actions manifestly criminal, and evidently repugnant to the divine laws, but also treat in the same manner the smallest marks of an internal propensity to the pleasures of sense, or of a disposition to comply with the customs of the world. They condemn, for example, elegant dress, rich furniture, every thing, in a word, that looks like ornament, or surpasses the bounds of absolute necessity. Their conduct also to offenders is truly merciless; for they expel them from the church without previous admonition, and never temper the rigour of their judgments by an equitable consideration of the infirmities of nature in this imperfect state. The other Mennonites are, by no means, chargeable with this severity towards their offending brethren; they exclude none from their communion but the obstinate contemners of the divine laws; nor do they proceed to this extremity even with regard to such, until repeated admonitions have proved ineffectual to reform them.

III. The more rigid Mennonites look upon those that are excommunicated as the pests of society, who are to be avoided upon all occasions, and to be banished from all the comforts of social intercourse. Neither the voice of nature, nor the ties of blood, are allowed to plead in their behalf, or to procure them the smallest degree of indulgence. In such a case the exchange of good offices, the sweets of friendly conversation, and the mutual effusions of tenderness and love are cruelly suspended even between parents and children, husbands and wives, and also in all the other endearing relations of human life. — But the more moderate branches of this community have wisely rejected this unnatural discipline, and look upon the honour and sanctity of the church to be sufficiently vindicated, when its members avoid a close and particular intimacy with those who have been expelled from its communion. IV. The rigid Anabaptists enjoin it as an obligation upon their disciples and the members of their community to wash the feet of their guests, as a token of brotherly love and affection, and in obedience to the example of CHRIST, which they suppose, in this case, to have the force of a positive command; and hence they are sometimes called *Padoniptæ*. But the other *Mennonites* deny that CHRIST meant, in this instance of his goodness and condescension, to recommend this custom to the imitation of

lib. x. v. 49. plainly declares, that many of the Anabaptists of *Munster* (who certainly had not been instructed by *MENNO*) held this very doctrine in relation to CHRIST's incarnation: .XX.

Esse (Christum) Deum statuunt alii, sed corpore carnem

Humanam sumpto sustinuisse negant:

At Diem mentem, tenuis quasi fauce canalis,

Per MARIE corpus virginis isse ferunt.

[d] Many writers are of opinion, that the *Waterlandians*, of all the other Anabaptists, shewed the strongest propensity to adopt the doctrine of *MENNO* relating to the origin of CHRIST's body. See *Histoire des Anabaptistes*, p. 223. — *Ceremonies et Coutumes de tous les Peuples du Monde*, tom. iv. p. 200. But that these writers are mistaken, is abundantly manifest from the public *Confession of Faith* of the *Waterlandians*, composed by *RIES*. See also, for a further refutation of this mistake, *HERM. SCHYNN Deductio Plenior Histor. Mennonit.* p. 165.

CHAP. XVI. his followers, or to give his example in this case, the authority of a positive precept.

The state of
learning and phi-
losophy among
the Anabaptists.

XIX. The Anabaptists, however divided on other subjects, were agreed in their notions of learning and philosophy, which, in former times, they unanimously considered as the pests of the Christian church, and as highly detrimental to the progress of true religion and virtue. Hence it happened, that among a considerable number of writers, who, in this century, employed their pens in the defence of that sect, there is none whose labours bear any inviting marks of learning or genius. The rigid *Mennonites* persevere still in the barbarous system of their ancestors, and, neglecting totally the improvement of the mind and the culture of the sciences, devote themselves entirely to trade, manual industry, and the mechanic arts. The *Waterlandians*, indeed, are honourably distinguished from all the other Anabaptists in this, as well as in many other respects. For they permit several members of their community to frequent the public universities, and there to apply themselves to the study of languages, history, antiquities, and more especially of physic, whose usefulness and importance they do not pretend to deny; and hence it happens, that, in our times, so many pastors among the Mennonites assume the title and profession of physicians. Nay more; it is not unusual to see Anabaptists of this more humane and moderate class engaged even in philosophical researches, on the excellence and utility of which their eyes are, at length, so far opened, as to make them acknowledge their importance to the well-being of society. It was, no doubt, in consequence of this change of sentiment, that they have erected, not long ago, a public seminary of learning at *Amsterdam*, in which there is always a person of eminent abilities chosen as professor of philosophy. But though these moderate Anabaptists acknowledge the benefit which may be derived to civil society from the culture of philosophy and the sciences, yet they still persevere so far in their ancient prejudices, as to consider theology as a system that has no connexion with them; and, consequently, they are of opinion, that in order to preserve it pure and untainted, the utmost caution must be used not to blend the dictates of philosophy with the doctrines of religion. It is farther to be observed, that, in the present times, even the *Flemish*, or *rigid* Anabaptists begin gradually to divest themselves of their antipathy to learning, and allow their brethren to apply themselves to the study of languages, history, and the other sciences.

Their division
into a multitude
of sects.

XX. That simplicity and ignorance, of which the ancient Anabaptists boasted as the guardians of their piety and the sources of their felicity, contributed principally to those divisions and schisms that reigned among them, from even their first rise, in a degree unknown and unexperienced in any other Christian community. This will appear evident to such as inquire with the smallest attention into the more immediate causes of their dissensions. For it is observable, that their most vehement contests had not for their object any difference in opinion concerning the doctrines or mysteries of religion, but generally turned upon matters relating to the conduct of life, on what was *lawful, decent, just, and pious* in actions and manners, and what,

what, on the contrary, was to be considered as *criminal* or *unseemly*. These disputes were a natural consequence of their favourite principle, that *holiness* of life and *purity* of manners were the authentic *marks* of the true church. But the misfortune lay here, that, being ignorant themselves, and under the guidance of persons whose knowledge was little superior to theirs, they were unacquainted with the true method of determining, in a multitude of cases, what was *pious*, *laudable*, and *lawful*, and what was *impious*, *unbecoming*, and *criminal*. The criterion they employed for this purpose was neither the decision of right reason, nor the authority of the divine laws, accurately interpreted; since their ignorance rendered them incapable of using these means of arriving at the truth. They judged, therefore, of these matters by the suggestions of fancy and the opinions of others. But as this method of discerning between right and wrong, decent and indecent, was extremely uncertain and precarious, and could not but produce a variety of decisions, according to the different feelings, fancies, tempers, and capacities of different persons, hence naturally arose diversity of sentiments, debates, and contests of various kinds. These debates produced schisms and divisions, which are never more easily excited, nor more obstinately fomented and perpetuated, than where ignorance, the true source of bigotry, prevails.

XXI. The Mennonites, after having been long in an uncertain and precarious situation, obtained a fixed and unmolested settlement in the United Provinces under the shade of a legal toleration procured for them by WILLIAM, prince of *Orange*, the glorious founder of Belgic liberty. This illustrious chief, who acted from principle in allowing liberty of conscience and worship to Christians of different denominations, was moreover engaged by gratitude to favour the Mennonites, who had assisted him, in the year 1572, with a considerable sum of money, when his coffers were almost exhausted [e]. The fruits, however, of this toleration were not immediately enjoyed by all the Anabaptists that were dispersed through the different Provinces of the rising Republic. For, in several places, both the civil magistrates and the clergy made a long and obstinate opposition to the will of the prince in this matter; particularly in the province of *Zealand* and the city of *Amsterdam*, where the remembrance of the plots the Anabaptists had laid and the tumults they had excited was still fresh in the minds of the people [f]. This opposition, indeed, was in a great measure conquered before the conclusion of this century, partly by the resolution and influence of WILLIAM the First and his son MAURICE, and partly by the exemplary conduct of the Mennonites, who manifested their zealous attachment to the republic on several occasions, and redoubled, instead of diminishing, the precautions, that might remove all grounds of suspicion to their disadvantage, and take from their adversaries every pretext which could render their

The first solid settlement of the Mennonites in the United Provinces.

[e] See BRANDT, *Historie der Reformatie in de Nederlande*, vol. i. p. 525, 526.—*Ceremonies et Coutumes de tous les Peuples du Monde*, tom. iv. p. 201.

[f] BRANDT *loc. cit.* book xi. p. 555. 586, 587. 609, 610. book xiv. p. 780. book xvi. p. 811.

CENT. XVI.

opposition justifiable. But it was not before the following century, that their liberty and tranquillity were fixed upon solid foundations, when, by a *Confession of Faith*, published in the year 1626, they cleared themselves from the imputation of those pernicious and detestable errors that had been laid to their charge [g].

The English
Anabaptists.

XXII. The sect in *England*, which rejects the custom of baptizing infants, are not distinguished by the title of *Anabaptists*, but by that of *Baptists*. It is, however, probable, that they derive their origin from the German and Dutch Mennonites, and that, in former times, they adopted their doctrine in all its points. That indeed is, by no means, the case at present; for the English Baptists differ, in many things, both from the ancient and modern Mennonites. They are divided into two sects. One of which is distinguished by the denomination of *General* or *Arminian Baptists* on account of their opposition to the doctrine of absolute and unconditional decrees; and the other by that of *Particular* or *Calvinistical Baptists* from the striking resemblance of their religious system to that of the Presbyterians, who have CALVIN for their chief [b]. The Baptists of this latter sect settled chiefly at *London*, and in the towns and villages adjacent; and they have departed so far from the tenets of their ancestors, that, at this day, they retain no more of the peculiar doctrines and institutions of the Mennonites, than the administration of baptism by immersion, and the refusal of that sacrament to infants, and those of tender years. And consequently they have none of those scruples relating to oaths, war, and the functions of magistracy, that still remain among even the most rational part of the modern Mennonites. They observe in their congregations the same rules of government and the same method of worship that are followed by the Presbyterians, and their community is under the direction of men eminent for their piety and learning [i]. From their *Confession of Faith*, that was published in the year 1643, it appears plainly, that their religious sentiments were the same then, that they are at this day [k].

The opinions of
the General and
Particular Ana-
baptists in Eng-
land.

XXIII. The *General* Baptists, or, as they are called by some, the *Anti-pædobaptists*, are dispersed in great numbers through several counties of *England*, and are, for the most part, persons of mean condition and almost totally destitute of learning and knowledge. This latter circumstance will appear less surprizing, when it is considered, that, like the ancient Mennonites, they profess a contempt of erudition and science. There is much latitude in their system of religious doctrine, which consists in such vague and general principles, as render their communion accessible to Christians of almost all denominations. And, accordingly, they tolerate, in fact, and receive among them persons of every sect, even Socinians and Arians; nor do they reject any from their communion who profess themselves Christians,

[g] See HERM. SCHYN, *Plenior Deductio Histor. Mennonit.* cap. iv. p. 79.

[b] See WHISTON'S *Memoirs of his Life and Writings*, vol. ii. p. 461.

[i] See a German Work composed by ANT. WILLIAM BÖHM, under the title of the *History of the Reformation in England*, p. 151. 473. 536. 1152.

[k] *Bibliothèque Britannique*, tom. vi. p. 2.

and receive the Holy Scriptures as the source of truth, and the rule of faith [l]. They agree with the *Particular Baptists* in this circumstance, that they admit to baptism adult persons only, and administer that sacrament by dipping or total immersion; but they differ from them in another respect, even in their repeating the administration of baptism to those, who had received it, either in a state of infancy, or by asperision, instead of dipping; for if the common accounts may be believed, the *Particular Baptists* don't carry matters so far. The following sentiments, rites, and tenets are also peculiar to the former: I. After the manner of the ancient Mennonites, they look upon their sect, as the only true Christian church, and, consequently, shun, with the most scrupulous caution, the communion of all other religious societies. II. They dip only once, and not three times, as is practised elsewhere, the candidates for baptism, and consider it as a matter of indifference whether that sacrament be administered in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or, in that of CHRIST alone. III. They adopt the doctrine of MENNO with respect to the *Millennium*, or thousand years reign of the saints with CHRIST upon earth: And iv. many of them embrace his particular opinion concerning the origin of Christ's body [m]. v. They look upon the precept of the apostles, prohibiting the use of blood, and things strangled [n], as a law that was designed to be in force in all ages and periods of the church. vi. They believe that the soul, from the moment that the body dies until its resurrection at the last day, remains in a state of perfect insensibility. vii. They use the ceremony of extreme unction. And to omit matters of a more trifling nature, viii. several of them observe the Jewish, as well as the Christian, sabbath [o]. These Baptists have three different classes of ecclesiastical governors, *bishops*, *elders*, and *deacons*; the first of these, among whom there have been several learned men [p], they modestly call *messengers* [q], as St. JOHN is known to have styled that Order, in the book of the *Revelations*.

[l] This appears evidently from their *Confession of Faith*, which appeared first in the year 1660, was republished by Mr. WHISTON, in the *Memoirs of his Life*, vol. ii. p. 561. and is drawn up with such latitude, that, with the removal or alteration of a few points *, it may be adopted by Christians of all denominations †. Mr. WHISTON, though an Arian, became a member of this baptist community, which, as he thought, came nearest to the simplicity of the primitive and apostolic age. The famous Mr. EMLYN, who was persecuted on account of his Socinian principles, joined himself also to this society, and died in their communion.

[(m) To wit, that the body of Jesus was not derived from the substance of the blessed Virgin, but created in her womb by an omnipotent act of the holy Spirit.

[n] ACTS xv. 29.

[o] These accounts of the doctrine of the Baptists are taken from WALL's *History of Infant Baptism*; and from the second volume of WHISTON's *Memoirs of his Life*, p. 465, &c.

[p] See WHISTON's *Memoirs of his Life*, tom. ii. p. 466. as also CROSBY's *History of the English Baptists*, published in four volumes 8^{vo} in the year 1728.

[q] St. JOHN calls them the *angels of the churches*; the word *angel* (in Greek ἀγγελοῦ) signifies properly an *envoy*, or *messenger*.

[* *Viz.* those relating to *Universal Redemption*, the *Perseverance of the Saints*, *Election* and *Reprobation*, which are illustrated entirely on Arminian principles, and consequently cannot be embraced by rigid Calvinists; not to mention the points relating to Baptism, which are the distinctive marks of this sect.]

[† Our author does not certainly mean to include Roman catholics in this large class, for then his assertion would not be true.]

CENT. XVI.

The Davidists, or
David-Georgi-
ans.

XXIV. Before we conclude the History of the Anabaptists, it may not be improper to mention a very singular and ridiculous sect that was founded by DAVID GEORGE, a native of *Delft*, and a member of that community. This enthusiast, after having laid the foundation of the sect of the *Davidists*, or *David-Georgians*, deserted the Anabaptists, and removed to *Basil* in *Switzerland*, in the year 1544, where he changed his name, and by the liberality and splendor that attended his opulence, joined to his probity and purity of manners, acquired a very high degree of esteem which he preserved till his death. The lustre of his reputation was, however, but transitory; for, soon after his decease, which happened in the year 1556, his son-in-law NICHOLAS BLES DYCK charged him with having maintained the most blasphemous and pestilential errors. The senate of *Basil*, before whom this accusation was brought, being satisfied with the evidence by which it was supported, pronounced sentence against the deceased heretic, and ordered his body to be dug up and to be publicly burnt. And, indeed, nothing more horridly impious and extravagant can possibly be conceived, than the sentiments and tenets of this fanatic, if they were really such as they have been represented, either by his accusers or his historians. For he is said to have given himself out for the son of God, the fountain of divine wisdom, to have denied the existence of angels, good and evil, of heaven and hell, and of the last judgment; and he is also charged with having trampled upon all the rules of decency and modesty with the utmost contempt [r]. In all this, however, it is very possible, that there may be much exaggeration. The enthusiast in question, though a man of some natural genius, was, nevertheless, totally destitute of learning of every kind, and had something obscure, harsh, and illiberal in his manner of expression, that gave too much occasion to an unfavorable interpretation of his religious tenets. That he had both more sense and more virtue, than is generally imagined, appears manifestly not only from his numerous writings, but also from the simplicity and candour that were visible in the temper and spirit of the disciples he left behind him, of whom several are yet to be found in *Holstein*, *Friesland*, and other countries [s]. He deplored the decline of vital and practical religion, and endeavoured to restore it among his followers; and, in this he seemed to imitate the example of the more moderate Anabaptists. But the excessive warmth of an irregular imagination threw him into illusions of the most dangerous and pernicious kind, and seduced him into a persuasion that he was honoured with the gift of divine inspiration, and had celestial visions constantly presented to his mind. Thus was he led to such a high degree of fanaticism, that, rejecting, as mean and

[r] See NIC. BLES DYCKII *Historia Davidis Georgii* à JACOBO REVIO edita; as also the Life of the same Fanatic written in the German language by STOLTERFOTH. Among the modern writers see ARNOLD'S *Kirchen und Ketzer-Historie*, tom. i. p. 750. tom. ii. p. 534. & 1183. in which there are several things that tend to clear the character of DAVID. See also HENR. MORI *Enthusiasmus Triumphatus*, sect. xxxiii. p. 23.—And the documents I have published in relation to this matter, in the *History of Servetus*, p. 425.

[s] See JOH. MOLLERI *Introduct. in Histor. Chersones. Cimbricae*, P. II. p. 116. & *Cimbriae Litteratae*, tom. i. p. 422.

useless, the external services of piety, he reduced religion to contemplation, silence, and a certain frame or habit of soul, which it is equally difficult to define and to understand. The soaring *Mysticks* and the visionary *Quakers* may, therefore, if they please, give DAVID GEORGE a distinguished rank in their enthusiastical community.

XXV. HENRY NICHOLAS, a *Westphalian*, one of the intimate companions of this fanatic, though somewhat different from him in the nature of his enthusiasm, and also in point of genius and character, founded a sect in *Holland*, in the year 1555, which he called the *Family of Love*. The principles of this sect were afterwards propagated in *England*, and produced no small confusion in both nations. The judgment that has been formed with respect to DAVID GEORGE may be applied with truth, at least in a great measure, to his associate NICHOLAS, who, perhaps, would have prevented a considerable part of the heavy reproaches with which he has been loaded, had he been endowed with a degree of genius, discernment, and knowledge sufficient to enable him to express his sentiments with perspicuity and elegance. Be that as it may, the character, temper, and views of this man may be learnt from the spirit that reigned in his flock [t]. As to his pretensions, they were, indeed, visionary and chimerical; for he maintained, that he had a commission from heaven to teach men, that the essence of religion consisted in the feelings of *divine love*; that all other theological tenets, whether they related to objects of faith or modes of worship, were of no sort of moment; and consequently, that it was a matter of the most perfect indifference, what opinions Christians entertained concerning the divine nature, provided their hearts burned with the pure and sacred flame of piety and love. To this, his main doctrine, NICHOLAS may have probably added other odd fancies, as always is the case with those innovators, who are endued with a warm and fruitful imagination; to come, however, at a true notion of the opinions of this enthusiast, it will be much wiser to consult his own writings, than to depend entirely upon the accounts and refutations of his adversaries [u].

The *Family of Love* founded by Henry Nicholas.

CHAP. IV.

The History of the Socinians.

I. THE *Socinians* are said to have derived this denomination from the illustrious family of the *Sozzini*, which flourished a long time at *Sienna in Tuscany*, and produced several great and eminent men, and among

The denomination and origin of this sect.

[t] See Jo. HORNBECK, *Summa Controvers.* lib. vi. p. 393.—ARNOLD, *Kirchen-und Ketzer-Historie*, p. 746.—BÖHM's *History of the Reformation in England*, (written in German) book iv. ch. v. p. 541.

[u] The most learned of all the authors, who wrote against the *Family of Love*, was Dr. HENRY MORE, in his *Grand Explanation of the Mystery of Godliness*, &c. book vi. chap. 12—18. GEORGE FOX, the founder of the sect of *Quakers*, inveighed also severely against this seraphic

CENT. XVI. others LÆLIUS and FAUSTUS SOZINUS, who are commonly supposed to have been the founders of this sect. The former was the son of MARIANUS, a famous lawyer, and was, himself, a man of uncommon genius and learning, to which he added, as his very enemies are obliged to acknowledge, the lustre of a virtuous life, and of unblemished manners. Being forced to leave his country, in the year 1547, on account of the disgust he had conceived against popery, he travelled through *France, England, Holland, Germany, and Poland*, in order to examine the religious sentiments of those who had thrown off the yoke of *Rome*, and thus at length to come at the truth. After this he settled at *Zurich*, where he died in the year 1562, before he had arrived at the fortieth year of his age [w]. His mild and gentle disposition rendered him averse from whatever had the air of contention and discord. He adopted the Helvetic confession of faith, and professed himself a member of the church of *Switzerland*; but this did not engage him to conceal entirely the doubts he had formed in relation to certain points of religion, and which he communicated, in effect, by letter to some learned men, whose judgment he respected, and in whose friendship he could confide [x]. His sentiments were indeed propagated, in a more public manner, after his death; since FAUSTUS, his nephew and his heir, is supposed to have drawn from the papers he left behind him that religious system upon which the sect of the Socinians was founded.

The term Socinian bears different significations.

II. It is, however, to be observed, that this denomination does not always convey the same ideas, since it is susceptible of different significations, and is, in effect, used sometimes in a more strict and proper, and, at others, in a more improper and extensive sense. For, according to the usual manner of speaking, all are termed *Socinians*, whose sentiments bear a certain affinity to the system of SOCINUS; and they are more especially ranked in that class, who either boldly deny or artfully explain away the doctrines that assert the *Divine Nature* of CHRIST, and a *Trinity* of persons in the Godhead. But, in a strict and proper sense, they only are deemed the members of this sect, who embrace wholly, or with a few exceptions, the form of theological doctrine which FAUSTUS SOCINUS either drew up himself, or received from his uncle, and delivered to the *Unitarian* brethren, or Socinians, in *Poland* and *Transylvania* [y].

Family, and called them a motley tribe of Fanatics, because they took oaths, danced, sung, and made merry. See SHEWEL's *History of the Quakers*, book iii. p. 88, 89: 344.

[w] CLOPPENBURG. *Dissertatio de origine et progressu Socinianismi*.—JO. HORNBECK, *Summa Controversiarum*, p. 563.—JO. HENR. HOTTINGER. *Hist. Eccles.* tom. ix. p. 417.

[x] ZANCHIUS, *Præf. ad Libr. de tribus Elohim*.—BEZA, *Epist. Volum.* ep. lxxxii. p. 167. Certain writings are attributed to him by SANDIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Antitrinitar.* p. 18. but it is very doubtful, whether he was the real author of them, or not.

[y] We have, hitherto, no compleat or accurate History either of the sect called Socinians, or of LÆLIUS and FAUSTUS SOCINUS its founders, nor any satisfactory account of those, who laboured principally with them, and after them in giving a permanent and stable form to this community. For the accounts we have of the Socinians, and their principal doctors, from HORNBECK (1), CALOVIUS (2), CLOPPENBURG (3), SANDIUS (4), LUBIENIECIUS (5), and LAUTERBACH (6),

(1) In his *Socinianism. Confutat.* vol. i.—(2) In his *Opera Anti-Sociniana*.—(3) In his *Dissertat. de origine et progressu Socinianismi*, tom. ii. opp.—(4) In his *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitariorum*.—(5) In his *Historia Reformationis Polonicae*.—(6) In his *Ariano-Socinianismus*, published in German at *Frankfort* in the year 1725.

III. The origin of *Socinianism* may be traced to the earliest period of the CENT. XVI. Reformation. For scarcely had that happy revolution in the state of religion taken place, when a set of men, fond of extremes, and consequently disposed to look upon, as erroneous, whatever had hitherto been taught and professed in the church of *Rome*, began to undermine the doctrine of CHRIST'S *Divinity* and the other truths that are connected with it, and proposed reducing the whole of religion to practical piety and virtue. The efforts of these men were opposed with united zeal and vigilance by the Romish, Reformed, and Lutheran churches, and their designs were so far disconcerted, as to prevent their forming themselves and their followers into a regular and permanent sect. So early as the year 1524, the *Divinity* of CHRIST was openly denied by LEWIS HETZER, one of the wandering and fanatical *Anabaptists*, who, about three years afterwards, was put to death at *Constance* [z]. There were not wanting, among the first *Anabaptists*, several persons who entertained the opinions of HETZER; though it would be manifestly unfair to lay these opinions to the charge of the whole community. But it was not only from that quarter that erroneous opinions were propagated in relation to the points already mentioned; others seemed to have been seized with the contagion, and it manifested itself from day to day in several countries. JOHN CAMPANUS, a native of *Juliers*, disseminated at *Wittemberg* and other places, various tenets of an heretical aspect, and taught, among other things, that the *Son* was inferior to the *Father*, and that the *Holy Ghost* was not the title of a *divine person*, but a *denomination* used to denote the *nature* of the *Father* and of the *Son*; and thus did this innovator revive, in a great measure, the errors of the ancient *Arians* [a]. A doctrine of a similar kind was propagated, in the year 1530, in *Switzerland*, *Augsbourg*, and among the *Grisons*, by a person, whose name was CLAUDIUS, who, by his opposition to the doctrine of CHRIST'S *divinity*, excited no small commotions in these countries [b]. But none of these new teachers were so far encouraged by the number of their followers, or the indulgence of their adversaries, as to be in a condition to form a regular sect.

are far from being proper to satisfy the curiosity of those, who desire something more than a vague and superficial knowledge of this matter. The History of Socinianism, that was published at *Paris* by LAMI in the year 1723, is a wretched compilation from the most common-place writers on that subject; it is also full of errors, and is loaded with a variety of matters that have no sort of relation to the history of SOCINUS, or to the doctrine he taught. The very learned and laborious LA CROZE promised, in his *Dissertations Historiques*, tom. i. p. 142. a complete History of Socinianism, from its origin to the present times, but did not fulfil this interesting engagement.

[z] SANDII *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitar.*—JO. BAPT. OTTIUS, *Annal. Anabaptist.* p. 50.—BREITINGERI *Museum Helveticum*, tom. v. p. 391. tom. vi. p. 100. 479.

[a] See the Dissertation de *Joh. Campano, Anti-Trinitario*, in the *Amoenitates Litterariae*, of the very learned SCHELHORNII, tom. xi. p. 1—92.

[b] See SCHELHORNII *Dissert. Epistol. de Mino Celso Senensi, Claudio item Allobroge, homine Fanatico et SS. Trinitatis hoste*, *Ulmæ* 1748, in 4^{to}.—JAC. BREITINGERI *Museum Helvetic.* tom. vii. p. 667.—JO. HALLERUS, *Epistol.* in JO. CONRAD. FUESLINI *Centuria Epistolar. Viror. Eruditor.* p. 140.

CENT. XVI.

Michael Ser-
vetus.

IV. The attempts of MICHAEL SERVEDE [c], or SERVETUS, a Spanish physician, were much more alarming to those, who had the cause of true religion at heart, than the feeble and impotent efforts of the innovators now mentioned. This man, who has made such a noise in the world, was born at *Villa nueva*, in the kingdom of *Arragon*, distinguished himself by the superiority of his genius, and had made a considerable progress in various branches of science. In the years 1531 and 1532, he published, in Latin, his *Seven Books concerning the errors that are contained in the doctrine of the Trinity*, and his *Two Dialogues* on the same subject, in which he attacked, in the most audacious manner, the sentiments adopted by far the greatest part of the Christian church in relation to the *Divine Nature*, and a *Trinity* of persons in the *Godhead*. Some years after this he travelled into *France*, and, after a variety of adventures, settled at *Vienne* in *Dauphiné*, where he applied himself with success to the practice of physick. It was here, that, letting loose the reins to his warm and irregular imagination, he invented that strange system of theology, which was printed, in a clandestine manner, in the year 1553, under the title of *Christianity restored*. The man seemed to be seized with a passion for reforming (in his way) and many things concurred to favour his designs, such as the fire of his genius, the extent of his learning, the power of his eloquence, the strength of his resolution, the obstinacy of his temper, and an external appearance, at least, of piety, that rendered all the rest doubly engaging. Add to all this, the protection and friendship of many persons of weight in *France*, *Germany*, and *Italy*, which SERVETUS had obtained by his talents and abilities both natural and acquired, and it will appear that few innovators have set out with a better prospect of success. But, notwithstanding these signal advantages, all his views were totally disappointed by the vigilance and severity of CALVIN, who, when SERVETUS had escaped from his prison at *Vienne*, and was passing through *Savitzerland* in order to seek refuge in *Italy*, caused him to be apprehended at *Geneva*, in the year 1553, and had an accusation of blasphemy brought against him before the council [d]. The issue of this accusation was fatal to SERVETUS, who, adhering resolutely to the opinions he had embraced, was, by a public sentence of the court, declared an obstinate heretic, and, in consequence thereof, condemned to the flames. For it is observable, that, at this time, the ancient laws that had been enacted against heretics by the emperor FREDERIC II, and had been so frequently renewed, after his reign, were still in vigour at *Geneva*. It must, however, be acknowledged, that this learned and ingenious sufferer was worthy of a better fate; though it is certain, on the other hand, that his faults were neither few nor trivial; since it is well known, that his excessive arrogance was

[c]. By taking away the last syllable of this name (I mean the Spanish termination *de*) there remains *Serve*, which, by placing differently the letters that compose it, makes *Reves*. SERVETUS assumed this latter name in the title-pages of all his books. He also called himself sometimes *Michael Villanovanus*, or *Villanovanus* alone, after the place of his nativity, omitting the name of his family.

[d]. This accusation was brought against SERVETUS by a person, who lived in CALVIN's family, as a servant; and this circumstance displeased many.]

accompanied

accompanied with a malignant and contentious spirit, an invincible obstinacy of temper, and a considerable portion of fanaticism [e].

V. The religious system, that SERVETUS had struck out of a wild and irregular fancy, was, indeed, singular in the highest degree. The greatest part of it was a necessary consequence of his peculiar notions concerning the universe, the nature of God, and the nature of things, which were equally strange and chimerical. Thus it is difficult to unfold, in a few words, the doctrine of this unhappy man; nor, indeed, would any detail render it intelligible in all its branches. He took it into his head that the true and genuine doctrine of CHRIST had been entirely lost, even before the council of Nice; and he was, moreover, of opinion, that it had never been delivered with a sufficient degree of precision and perspicuity in any period of the church. To these extravagant assertions he added another still more so, even that he, himself, had received a commission from above to reveal anew this divine doctrine, and to explain it to mankind. His notions, with respect to the supreme Being, and a Trinity of persons in the God-head, were obscure and chimerical beyond all measure, and amounted in general to the following propositions: "That the Deity, before the creation of the world, had produced within himself two personal representations or manners of existence [f], which were to be the medium of intercourse between him and mortals, and by whom, consequently, he was to reveal his will, and to display his mercy and beneficence to the children of men; that these two representatives were the Word and the Holy Ghost; that the former was united to the man CHRIST, who was born of the Virgin MARY by an omnipotent act of the divine will; and that on this account CHRIST might be properly called God; that the Holy Spirit directed the course and

The doctrine of
Servetus.

[e] Dr. MOSHEIM refers the reader here, in a note, to an ample and curious history of SERVETUS, composed by him in the German language, of which the first edition was published at Helmstadt in 4^{to} in the year 1748, and the second, with considerable additions, at the same place, the year following. Those who are not acquainted with the German language, will find a full account of this singular man, and of his extraordinary history in a Latin dissertation, composed under the inspection of Dr. MOSHEIM, and published at Helmstadt under the following title: *Historia Michaelis Serveti, quam Præside Jo. Laur. Moshemio, Abbate, &c. placido Doctorum examini publice exponit HENRICUS AB ALLWOERDEN.* There is an accurate history of this unhappy man in the first volume of the work, entitled, *Memoirs of Literature, containing a Weekly Account of the State of Learning, both at home and abroad.* This was composed by Monsieur DE LA ROCHE, and was afterwards augmented by him and translated into French, in his *Bibliothèque Angloise*, tom. ii. part. I. art. vii. p. 76.—There is also an account of SERVETUS given by MACKENZIE, in the first volume of his *Lives and Characters of the most eminent Writers of the Scot's Nation*, which was published at Edinburgh in the year 1798.

It is impossible to justify the conduct of CALVIN in the case of SERVETUS, whose death will be an indelible reproach upon the character of that great and eminent Reformer. The only thing that can be alledged, not to efface, but to diminish his crime, is, that it was no easy matter for him to divest himself at once of that persecuting spirit which had been so long nourished and strengthened by the popish religion in which he was educated. It was a remaining portion of the spirit of popery in the breast of CALVIN that kindled his unchristian zeal against the wretched SERVETUS. We have a like instance of unpardonable severity in the conduct of the valuable and, otherwise humane, archbishop CRANMER towards the unhappy fanatic, called the *Maid of Kent*.

[f] These representations or manners of existence SERVETUS also called *æconomies, dispensations, dispositions* &c. for he often changed his terms in unfolding his visionary system.]

“ animated

CENT. XVI

“ animated the whole system of nature, and more especially, produced in the minds of men wise counsels, virtuous propensities, and divine feelings; and, finally, that these two *Representations* were to cease after the destruction of this terrestrial globe, and to be absorbed into the *substance* of the *Deity*, from whence they had been formed.” This is, at least, a general sketch of the doctrine of SERVETUS, who, however, did not always explain his system in the same manner, nor take any pains to avoid inconsistencies and contradictions, and who frequently expressed himself in such ambiguous terms, that it is extremely difficult to learn from them his true sentiments. His system of morality agreed in many circumstances with that of the *Anabaptists*; whom he also imitated in censuring with the utmost severity the custom of *Infant-baptism*.

Other Anti-Trinitarians.

VI. The pompous plans of Reformation, that had been formed by SERVETUS, were not only disconcerted but even fell into oblivion, after the death of their author. He was, indeed, according to vulgar report, supposed to have left behind him a considerable number of disciples, and we find in the writings of the doctors of this century many complaints and apprehensions that seem to confirm this supposition, and would persuade us that SERVETUS had really founded a sect; yet when this matter is attentively examined, there will appear just reason to doubt whether this man left behind him any one person, that might properly be called his true disciple. For those, who were denominated *Servetians* by the theological writers of this century, not only differed from SERVETUS in many points of doctrine, but also varied widely from him in his doctrine of the Trinity, which was the peculiar and distinguishing point of his theological system. VALENTINE GENTILIS, a Neapolitan, who suffered death at Bern in the year 1566, adopted the Arian hypothesis, and not that of SERVETUS, as many writers have imagined; for his only error consisted in this, that he considered the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost*, as subordinate to the *Father* [g]. Nearly allied to this was the doctrine of MATTHEW GRIBALDI, a lawyer, whom a timely death, in the year 1566, saved from the severity of an ecclesiastical tribunal, that was ready to pronounce sentence against him on account of his errors; for he supposed the *divine nature* divided into *three eternal spirits*, which were distinguished from each other not only by *number*, but also by *subordination* [h]. It is not so easy to determine the particular charge that was brought against ALCIAT, a native of Piedmont, and SYLVESTER TELLIS who were banished from the city and territory of Geneva in the year 1559; nor do we know, with any degree of certainty, the errors that were embraced by PARUTA, LEONARDI, and others [i], who were ranked among the

[g] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article GENTILIS.—SPON, *Hist. de Geneve*, livr. iii. tom. ii. p. 80.—SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 26.—LAMY, *Histoire du Socinianisme*, part. II. ch. vi. p. 251.—FUESL. *Reformations-Beytrage*, tom. v. p. 381.

[h] SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 17.—LAMY *loc. cit.* part. II. ch. vii. p. 257.—SPON *loc. cit.* tom. ii. p. 85. not.—HALLERUS, in *Museo Tigurino*, tom. ii. p. 114.

[i] For an account of these, and other persons of the same class, see SANDIUS, LAMY, and also LUBIENIECIUS, his *Historia Reformat. Polonica*, lib. ii. cap. v. p. 96.—There is a particular and
followers

followers of SERVETUS. It is, however, more than probable, that none of the persons now mentioned, were the disciples of SERVETUS, or adopted the hypothesis of that visionary innovator. The same thing may be affirmed with respect to GONESIUS, who is said to have embraced the doctrine of that unhappy man, and to have introduced it into Poland [k], for, though he maintained some opinions that really resembled it, in some of its points; yet his manner of explaining the mystery of the Trinity was totally different from that of SERVETUS.

VII. It is evident that none of the persons, now mentioned, professed that form or system of theological doctrine, that is properly called *Socinianism*, the origin of which is, by the writers of that sect, dated from the year 1546, and placed in *Italy*. These writers tell us, that, in this very year, above forty persons, eminently distinguished by their learning and genius, and still more by their generous zeal for truth, held secret assemblies, at different times, in the territory of *Venice*, and particularly at *Vicenza*, in which they deliberated concerning a general reformation of the received systems of religion, and, in a more especial manner, undertook to refute the peculiar doctrines that were afterwards publicly rejected by the Socinians. They tell us further, that the principal members of this clandestine society were LÆLIUS SOCINUS, ALCIAT, OCHINUS, PARUTA, and GENTILIS; that their design was divulged and their meetings discovered by the temerity and imprudence of some of their associates; that two of them were apprehended and put to death, while the rest, being dispersed, sought a refuge in *Switzerland*, *Germany*, *Moravia*, and other countries, and that SOCINUS, after having wandered up and down in several parts of *Europe*, went into *Poland* first in the year 1551, and afterwards in 1558, and there sowed the seeds of his doctrine, which in process of time grew apace and produced a rich and abundant harvest [l]. Such is the account of the origin of Socinianism, that is generally given by the writers of that sect. To assert that it is, in every circumstance,

Erroneous accounts of the origin of Socinianism.

ample account of ALCIAT given by BAYLE in the first volume of his *Dictionary*; see also SPON *loc. cit.* tom. ii. p. 85, 86.

[k] This is affirmed upon the authority of WISSOWATIUS and LUBIENIECIUS; but the very words of the latter will be sufficient to shew us upon what grounds.—These words (*Hist. Reformat. Polon.* cap. vi. p. 111.) are as follows: *Is Serveti sententiam de præ-eminencia patris in patriam attulit, eamque non dissimulavit, i. e. GONESIUS introduced into Poland the opinion embraced by Servetus in relation to the pre-eminence of the father, and was, by no means, studious to conceal it.* Who, now, does not see, that, if it was the pre-eminence of the father that GONESIUS maintained, he must have differed considerably from SERVETUS, whose doctrine removed all real distinction in the divine nature. The reader will do well to consult SANDIUS (*loc. cit.* p. 40.) concerning the sentiments of GONESIUS; since it is from this writer, that LAMY has borrowed the greatest part of what he has advanced in his *Histoire de Socinianisme*, tom. ii. ch. x. p. 278.

[l] See the *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinit.* p. 18. & 25. of SANDIUS, who mentions some writings that are supposed to have been published by the clandestine society of pretended Reformers at *Venice* and *Vicenza*; though the truth of this supposition is extremely dubious;—ANDR. WISSOWATII *Narratio, quomodo in Polonia Reformati ab Unitariis separati sunt*, which is subjoined to the *Biblioth.* of SANDIUS, p. 209, 210.—The reader may likewise consult LUBIENIECIUS, *Hist. Reformat. Polon.* lib. ii. cap. i. p. 38. who intimates, that he took this account of the origin of Socinianism from the manuscript *Commentaria* of BUDZINUS, and his *Life* of LÆLIUS SOCINUS. See also SAM. PRZIPCOWIUS, in *Vita Socini*.

fictitious

CENT. XVI. fictitious and false, would perhaps be going too far: but, on the other hand, it is easy to demonstrate that the system of religion, commonly called *Socinianism*, was neither invented nor drawn up in those meetings at *Venice* and *Vicenza* that have now been mentioned [m].

[m] See GUSTAV. GEORG. ZELTNERI *Historia Crypto-Socinianismi Altorfni*, ca. ii. § xli. p. 321. not.—This writer seems to think that the inquiries that have hitherto been made into this affair are, by no means, satisfactory; and he therefore wishes that some men of learning, equal to the task, would examine the subject anew.—This, indeed, were much to be wished. In the mean time, I shall venture to offer a few observations, which may perhaps contribute to cast some light upon this matter. That there was, in reality, such a society as is mentioned in the text, is far from being improbable. Many circumstances and relations prove sufficiently, that, immediately after the Reformation had taken place in *Germany*, secret assemblies were held and measures proposed, in several provinces that were still under the jurisdiction of *Rome*, with a view to combat the errors and superstition of the times. It is also, in a more especial manner, probable, that the territory of *Venice* was the scene of these deliberations; since it is well known, that a great number of the Venetians at this time, though they had no personal attachment to LUTHER, approved, nevertheless, of his design of reforming the corrupt state of religion, and wished well to every attempt that was made to restore Christianity to its native and primitive simplicity. It is further highly credible, that these assemblies were interrupted and dispersed by the vigilance of the papal emissaries, that some of their members were apprehended and put to death, and that the rest saved themselves by flight. All this is probable enough; but it is extremely improbable, nay utterly incredible, that all the persons, who are said to have been present at these assemblies, were really so. And I therefore adopt willingly the opinion of those, who affirm, that many persons, who, in after times, distinguished themselves from the multitude by opposing the doctrine of *Trinity in Unity*, were considered as members of the Venetian society by ignorant writers who looked upon that society as the source and nursery of the whole *Unitarian* sect. It is certain, for instance, that OCHINUS is erroneously placed among the members of the famous society now mentioned; for not to insist upon this circumstance, that it is not sufficiently clear whether he was really a Socinian or not, it appears undeniably from the *Annales Capucinorum* of BOVERIUS, as well as from other unquestionable testimonies, that he left *Italy* so early as the year 1543, and went from thence to *Geneva*. See a singular book, entitled, *La Guerre Seraphique ou l'Histoire des perils, qu'a courus la Barbe des Capucins*, livr. iii. p. 191. 216.—What I have said of OCHINUS may be confidently affirmed with respect to LÆLIUS SOCINUS, who, though reported to have been at the head of the society now under consideration, was certainly never present at any of its meetings. For how can we suppose that a young man only one and twenty years old, would leave the place of his nativity, repair to *Venice* or *Vicenza*, and that without any other view than the pleasure of disputing freely on certain points of religion *? Or how could it happen, that a youth of such unexperienced years should acquire such a high degree of influence and authority as to obtain the first rank, and the principal direction in an assembly composed of so many eminently learned and ingenious men? Besides, from the *Life* of LÆLIUS, which is still extant, and from other testimonies of good authority it is easy to shew, that it was the desire of improvement and the hope of being aided, in his inquiries after truth, by the conversation of learned men in foreign nations, that induced him to leave *Italy*, and not the apprehension of persecution and death, as some have imagined. It is also certain, that he returned into his native country afterwards, and, in the year 1551, remained some time at *Sienna*, while his father lived at *Bologna*. See his letter to BULLINGER, in the *Museum Helveticum*, tom. v. p. 489. Now surely it cannot easily be imagined, that a man in his senses would return to a country from whence, but a few years before, he had been obliged to fly, in order to avoid the terrors of a barbarous inquisition and a violent death.

But waving this question for a moment, let us suppose all the accounts, we have from the Socinians, concerning this famous assembly of *Venice* and *Vicenza*, and the members of which it was composed, to be true and exact; yet it remains to be proved, that the Socinian system of doctrine was invented and drawn up in that assembly. This the Socinian writers maintain; and this, as the case appears to me, may be safely denied. For the Socinian doctrine is undoubtedly of much

[* Is such a supposition really so absurd? Is not a spirit of enthusiasm, or even an uncommon degree of zeal adequate to the production of such an effect?]

VIII. While, therefore, we reject this inaccurate account of the matter under consideration, it is incumbent upon us to substitute a better in its place; and, indeed, the origin and progress of the Socinian doctrine seem easy to be traced out by such as are acquainted with the history of the church during this century. There were certain sects and doctors, against whom the zeal, vigilance, and severity of Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists were united, and, in opposing whose settlement and progress, these three communions, forgetting their dissensions, joined their most vigorous counsels and endeavours. The objects of their common aversion were the *Anabaptists*, and those who denied the *Divinity* of CHRIST and a *Trinity* of Persons in the Godhead. To avoid the unhappy consequences of such a formidable opposition great numbers of both classes retired into *Poland* from this persuasion, that in a country whose inhabitants were passionately fond of freedom, religious liberty could not fail to find a refuge. However, on their first arrival they proceeded with circumspection and prudence, and explained their sentiments with much caution and a certain mixture of disguise, not knowing surely what might happen, nor how far their opinions would be treated with indulgence. Thus they lived in peace and quiet, during several years, mixed with the Lutherans and Calvinists, who had already obtained a solid settlement in *Poland*, and who admitted them into their communion, and even into the assemblies where their public deliberations were held. They were not, however, long satisfied with this state of constraint, notwithstanding the privileges with which it was attended, but having insinuated themselves into the friendship of several noble and opulent families, they began to act with more spirit, and even to declare, in an open manner, their opposition to certain doctrines that were generally received among Christians. Hence arose violent contests between them and the Swiss, or Reformed churches, with which they had been principally

CENT. XVI.
The real origin of
Socinianism.

later date than this assembly; it also passed through different hands, and was, during many years, reviewed and corrected, by men of learning and genius, and thus underwent various changes and improvements before it was formed into a regular, permanent, and connected system. To be convinced of this, it will be sufficient to cast an eye upon the opinions, doctrines, and reasonings of several of the members of the famous society, so often mentioned; which vary in such a striking manner, as shew manifestly that this society had no fixed views, nor had ever agreed upon any consistent form of doctrine. We learn moreover from many circumstances in the life and transactions of LÆLIUS SOCINUS, that this man had not, when he left *Italy*, laid the plan of a regular system of religion; and it is well known, that for many years afterwards his time was spent in doubting, inquiring, and disputing; and that his ideas of religious matters were extremely fluctuating and unsettled. So that it seems probable to me, that the man died in this state of hesitation and uncertainty before he had reduced his notions to any consistent form. As to GRIBALDI and ALCIAT, who have been already mentioned, it is manifest, that they inclined towards the Arian system, and did not entertain such low ideas of the person and dignity of JESUS CHRIST, as those that are adopted among the Socinians. From all this it appears abundantly evident, that these Italian Reformers, if their famous society ever existed in reality (which I admit here as a probable supposition, rather than as a fact sufficiently attested) were dispersed and obliged to seek their safety in a voluntary exile, before they had agreed about any regular system of religious doctrine. So that this account of the origin of Socinianism is rather imaginary, than real, though it has been inconsiderately adopted by many writers. FUESSLIN has alledged several arguments against it in his German work, entitled, *Reformations-Beyträgen*, tom. iii. p. 327.

CENT. XVI.

connected. These diffensions drew the attention of the government, and occasioned, in the year 1565, a resolution of the diet of *Petrikow*, ordering the innovators to separate themselves from the churches already mentioned, and to form a distinct congregation or sect [n]. These founders of the Socinian church were commonly called *Pinczovians*, from the town in which the heads of their sect resided. Hitherto, indeed, they had not carried matters so far as they did afterwards; for they professed chiefly the Arian doctrine concerning the divine nature, maintaining that the *Son* and the *Holy Ghost* were two distinct natures, begotten by *God the Father*, and subordinate to him [o].

The progress of
Socinianism.

IX. The *Unitarians*, being thus separated from the other religious societies in *Poland*, had many difficulties to encounter, both of an internal and external kind. From without they were threatened with a formidable prospect arising from the united efforts of Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists, to crush their infant sect. From within they dreaded the effects of intestine discord, which portended the ruin of their community before it could arrive at any measure of stability or consistence. This latter apprehension was too well grounded; for, as yet, they had agreed upon no regular system of principles, which might serve as a center and bond of union. Some of them chose to persevere in the doctrine of the Arians, and to proceed no further; and these were called *Farnovians* [p]. Others, more adventurous, went much greater lengths, and attributed to *CHRIST* almost no other rank or dignity than those of a divine messenger, and of a true prophet. A third class, distinguished by the denomination of *Budneians* [q], went still further: declaring that *JESUS CHRIST* was born in an ordinary way, according to the general law of nature, and that, consequently, he was no proper object of divine worship or adoration [r]. There were also among these people several fanatics, who were desirous of introducing into the society the discipline of the enthusiastic Anabaptists, such as a community of goods, an equality of ranks, and other absurdities of the same nature [s]. Such were the disagreeable and perilous circumstances in which the *Uni-*

[n] LAMY, *Histoire du Socinianisme*, part. I. ch. vi. &c. p. 16.—STOINII *Epitome Originis Unitariorum in Polonia*, apud SANDIUM, p. 183.—GEORG. SCHOMANNI *Testamentum*, apud eundem, p. 194.—ANDR. WISSOWATIUS *de Separatione Unitar. a Reformatis*, ibid. p. 211, 212.—LUBIENECIUS, *Histor. Reformat. Polonica*, lib. ii. cap. vi. p. 111, cap. viii. p. 144 lib. iii. cap. i. p. 158.

[o] This will appear abundantly evident to all such as consult, with a proper degree of attention, the writers mentioned in the preceding note. It is unquestionably certain, that all those, who then called themselves *Unitarian Brethren*, did not entertain the same sentiments concerning the Divine Nature. Some of the most eminent doctors of that sect adopted the notions relating to the *person* and *dignity* of *CHRIST*, that were, in after times, peculiar to the Socinians; the greatest part of them, however, embraced the Arian system, and affirmed, that our blessed Saviour was created before the formation of the world, by *God the Father*, to whom he was much inferior, nevertheless, in dignity and perfection.

[(p)] For a more particular account of the *Farnovians*, see § xxii. of this chapter.]

[(q)] See the part of this chapter referred to in the preceding note.]

[(r)] *Vita Andr. Wissowatii* in SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trin.* p. 226.—As also SANDIUS in *Simone Budnaco*, p. 54.

[(s)] LUBIENECII *Hist. Reform. Polon.* lib. iii. cap. xii. p. 240.

Unitarians were placed, during the infancy of their sect, and which, no doubt, rendered their situation extremely critical and perplexing. But they were happily extricated out of these difficulties by the dexterity and resolution of certain of their doctors, whose efforts were crowned with singular success on account of the credit and influence they had obtained in *Poland*. These Unitarian doctors suppressed, in a little time, the factions that threatened the ruin of their community, erected flourishing congregations at *Cracow*, *Lublin*, *Pinczow*, *Luck*, *Smila* [t] (a town belonging to the famous DUDITH [u],) and in several other places both in *Poland* and *Lithuania*, and obtained the privilege of printing their productions and those of their brethren without molestation or restraint [w]. All these advantages were crowned by a signal mark of liberality and munificence, they received from Jo. SIENIENIUS, palatine of *Podolia*, who gave them a settlement in the city of *Racow*, which he had himself built, in the year 1569, in the district of *Sendomir* [x]. This extraordinary favour was peculiarly adapted to better the state of the Unitarians, who were, hitherto, dispersed far and wide in the midst of their enemies. And accordingly they now looked upon their religious establishment as permanent and stable, and presumed so far upon their good fortune, as to declare *Racow*, the centre of their community, where their distant and dispersed members might unite their counsels and hold their deliberations.

X. When they saw their affairs in this promising situation, the first thing that employed the attention and zeal of their doctors and spiritual rulers was a translation of the Bible into the Polish language, which was accordingly published in the year 1572. They had, indeed, before this a Polish

A summary view
of the religion
they professed.

[t] MART. ADALT, *Historia Arianismi Smigliensis*, Ged. 1741, in 8^{vo}.

[u] This DUDITH, who was certainly one of the most learned and eminent men of the sixteenth century, was born at *Buda* in the year 1533; and after having studied in the most famous universities, and travelled through almost all the countries of *Europe*, was named to the bishoprick of *Pina*, by the Emperor FERDINAND, and made privy counsellor to that prince. He had, by the force of his genius and the study of the ancient orators, acquired such a masterly and irresistible eloquence, that in all public deliberations he carried every thing before him. In the council, where he was sent, in the name of the emperor and of the Hungarian clergy, he spoke with such energy against several abuses of the church of *Rome*, and particularly against the celibacy of the clergy, that the pope, being informed thereof by his legates, solicited the emperor to recal him. FERDINAND complied; but, having heard DUDITH's report of what passed in that famous council, he approved of his conduct, and rewarded him with the bishoprick of *Chonat*. He afterwards married a maid of honour of the queen of *Hungary*, and resigned his bishoprick; the emperor, however, still continued his friend and protector. The papal excommunication was levelled at his head, but he treated it with contempt. Tired of the fopperies and superstitions of the church of *Rome* he retired to *Cracow*, where he embraced the protestant religion publicly, after having been for a good while its secret friend. It is said, that he shewed some inclination towards the Socinian system. Some of his friends deny this; others confess it, but maintain that he afterwards changed his sentiments in that respect. He was well acquainted with several branches of philosophy, and the mathematics, with the sciences of physic, history, theology, and the civil law. He was such an enthusiastical admirer of CICERO, that he copied over three times, with his own hand, the whole works of that immortal author. He had something majestic in his figure, and in the air of his countenance. His life was regular and virtuous, his manners elegant and easy, and his benevolence warm and extensive.]

[w] SANDII *Bibliotheca Anti-Trin.* p. 201.

[x] SANDIUS *loc. citat.* p. 201.—LUBIENIECIUS *loc. cit.* p. 239.

CENT. XVI.

version of the sacred writings, which they had composed jointly with the Helvetic doctors, in the year 1565, while they lived in communion with that church. But after the breach of that communion, and the order they had received to separate themselves from the Reformed church, this Version lost its credit among them, as it did not seem proper to answer their views [y]. After they had finished their new Version they drew up a summary of their religious doctrine, which was published at Cracow, in the year 1574, under the title of *Catechism*, or *Confession* of the Unitarians [z]. The system of religion, that is contained in this Catechism, is remarkable

[y] See a German work of RINGELTAUBE, entitled, *Von den Pölnischen Bibeln*, p. 90. 113. 142. in which there is a further account of the Polish interpretations of the Bible composed by Socinian authors.

[z] From this little performance, and indeed from it alone, we may learn, with certainty, the true state of the Unitarian religion before FAUSTUS SOCINUS; and, nevertheless, I don't find that it has been so much as once quoted, or even mentioned by any of the Socinian writers, by any historians who have given an account of their sect, nor yet by any of the divines that have drawn the pen of controversy against their religious system. I am almost inclined to believe, that the Socinians (when, in process of time, they had gained ground, acquired more dexterity in the management of their affairs, and drawn up a new, specious, and artful summary of their doctrine) were prudent enough to desire that this primitive Catechism should disappear, that it might not furnish their adversaries with an occasion of accusing them of inconstancy in abandoning the tenets of their ancestors, nor excite factions and divisions among themselves by inducing any of their people to complain that they had deviated from the ancient simplicity of their first founders. These reasons, very probably, engaged the Socinian doctors to buy up all the copies, they could find, of this original *Confession* or *Catechism*, with a view to bury it in oblivion. It will not therefore be improper to give here some account of the form and matter of this first Socinian Creed, which contained the doctrine of that sect before the *Racovian Catechism* was composed. This account will throw new light upon a period and branch of Ecclesiastical History that are highly interesting. The original Catechism, now under consideration, which is extremely rare, has the following title prefixed to it: *Catechism or Confession of Faith of the Congregation assembled, in Poland, in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, who was crucified and raised from the dead*—DEUTER. vi. Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is One God—JOHN viii. 54. It is my Father—of whom ye say that he is your God. Printed by Alexander Turobinus, born in the year of Christ, the Son of God, 1574, in 12 (1). We find by a passage, at the end of the Preface, that this curious Catechism was printed at Cracow; for it is said to have been published in that city, in the year 1574, after the birth of Christ. Now it is known, that the Unitarians had, at that time, a Printing-house at Cracow, which was, soon after, removed to Radow. Alexander Turobinus, who is said to have been the printer of this little production, is mentioned by SANDIUS (in his *Biblioth. Antitryn.* p. 51.) under the denomination of TUROBINCYCK, which he undoubtedly derived from Turobin, a town in the Palatinate of Chelm, in Little or Red Russia, which was the place of his nativity. The author of this Catechism was the famous GEORGE SCHOMAN, as has been evidently proved from a piece, entitled, *Schomanni Testamentum* (2); and other circumstances, by JO. ADAM MULLERUS, in his *Dissertation de Unitariorum Catechesi et Confessione omnium* (3). The Preface, which is composed in the name of the whole Congregation, begins with the following salutation: *To all those, who thirst after eternal salvation, the LITTLE and AFFLICTED FLOCK in Poland, which is baptized in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, sendeth greeting; praying most earnestly that grace and peace may*

(1) The original title runs thus: *Catechesis et confessio fidei coetus per Poloniam congregati in nomine Jesu Christi, Domini nostri, crucifixi et resuscitati*, Deut. vi. Audi, Israel, Dominus Deus noster Deus unus est, Johannis viii. dicit Jesus: Quem vos dicitis vestrum esse Deum, est pater meus. Typis Alexandri Turobini, anno nati Jesu Christi, filii Dei, 1574, in 12.

(2) This *Testament* is published by SANDIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Anti-Trin.* p. 51.

(3) The Dissertation of MULLERUS is to be found in a collection of pieces published by BARTHOLOMÆUS under the following title: *Fortgesetzten nützlichen Anmerkungen von allerhand Materien*, part. xxi. p. 758.

for its simplicity, and is neither loaded with scholastic terms nor subtle discussions; but it, nevertheless, breathes, in several places, the spirit of Socinianism, and that even in those parts of it which its authors look upon

as shed upon them by the one, supreme God and Father, through his only-begotten Son, our Lord, Jesus Christ who was crucified (4). After this general salutation the Prefacers give an account of the reasons that engaged them to compose and publish this Confession. The principal of these reasons was, the reproaches and aspersions that were cast upon the Anabaptists in several places; from which we learn that, at this time, the denomination of Anabaptists was given to those, who, in after times, were called Socinians. The rest of this Preface is employed in beseeching the reader to be firmly persuaded, that the designs of the Congregation are pious and upright, to read with attention, that he may judge with discernment, and, abandoning the doctrine of Babylon and the conduct and conversation of Sodom, to take refuge in the Ark of Noah, i. e. among the Unitarian Brethren.

In the beginning of the Catechism itself, the whole doctrine of Christianity is reduced to six points. The first relates to the Nature of God, and his Son Jesus Christ; the second to Justification; the third to Discipline; the fourth to Prayer; the fifth to Baptism; and the sixth to the Lord's Supper. These six points are explained at length in the following manner: Each point is defined and unfolded, in general terms, in one question and answer, and is afterwards sub-divided into its several branches in various questions and answers, in which its different parts are illustrated, and confirmed by texts of Scripture. From this it appears, at first sight, that the primitive state of Socinianism was a state of real infancy and weakness, that its doctors were, by no means, distinguished by the depth or accuracy of their theological knowledge, and that they instructed their flock in a superficial manner, by giving them only some vague notions of certain leading doctrines and precepts of religion. In their definition of the Nature of God, with which this Catechism begins, the authors discover immediately their sentiments concerning JESUS CHRIST, by declaring that he, together with all other things, is subject to the supreme Creator of the universe. It may also be observed as a proof of the ignorance or negligence of these authors, that, in illustrating the nature and perfections of the Deity, they make not the least mention of his infinity, his omniscience, his immensity, his eternity, his omnipotence, his omnipresence, his spirituality, nor of those other perfections of the divine nature that surpass the comprehension of finite minds. Instead of this, they characterize the supreme Being only by his wisdom, his immortality, his goodness, and unbounded dominion and empire over the creatures. By this it would seem, that, even in this early period of Socinianism, the rulers of that sect had adopted it, as a maxim, that nothing incomprehensible or mysterious was to be admitted into their religious system.—Their erroneous notion concerning JESUS CHRIST is expressed in the following terms: Our mediator before the throne of God is a man, who was formerly promised to our fathers by the prophets, and in these latter days was born of the seed of David, and whom God, the Father has made Lord and Christ, that is, the most perfect prophet, the most holy priest, and the most triumphant king, by whom he created the new world (5), by whom he has sent peace upon earth, restored all things and reconciled them to himself, and by whom also he has bestowed eternal life upon his elect; to the end that, after the supreme God, we should believe in him, adore and invoke him, bear his voice, imitate his example, and find, in him, rest to our souls (6). It is here worthy of note, that, although they call CHRIST a most holy priest, and justify this title by citations from Scripture, yet they, no where, explain the nature of that priesthood, which they attribute to him.—With respect to the Holy Ghost, they plainly deny his being a divine person, and represent him as no-

(4) Omnibus salutem eternam sitientibus, gratiam ac pacem ab uno illo altissimo Deo patre, per unigenitum ejus filium, Dominum nostrum, Jesum Christum crucifixum, ex animo precatur COETUS EXIGUUS ET AFFLICTUS per Poloniam, in nomine ejusdem Jesu Christi Nazareni baptizatus.

(5) This expression is remarkable; for these doctors maintained, that these declarations of Scripture, which represent the world as formed by Christ, do not relate to the visible world, but to the restoration of mankind to virtue and happiness by the son of God. They invented this interpretation to prevent their being obliged to acknowledge the divine glory and creating power of Christ.

(6) Est homo, mediator noster apud Deum, patribus olim per prophetas promissus, et ultimis tandem temporibus ex Davidis semine natus, quem Deus pater fecit Dominum et Christum, hoc est, perfectissimum prophetam, sanctissimum sacerdotem, invictissimum regem, per quem mundum creavit, omnia restauravit, secum reconciliavit, pacificavit, et vitam eternam electis suis donavit: ut in illum, post Deum altissimum, credamus, illum adoremus, invocemus, audiamus, pro modulo nostro imitemur, et, in illo, requiem animabus nostris inveniamus.

CENT. XVI. as most important and fundamental. Nor will this appear surprizing to those, who consider, that the papers of LÆLIUS SOCINUS, which he undoubtedly left behind him in Poland, were in the hands of many, and that

thing more than a divine quality, or virtue, as appears from the following passage: *The Holy Ghost is the energy or perfection of God, whose fulness God the Father bestowed upon his only-begotten Son, our Lord, that we, becoming his adopted children, might receive of his fulness* (7).—They express their sentiments concerning Justification in the ensuing terms: *Justification consists in the remission of all our past sins, through the mere grace and mercy of God, in and by our Lord Jesus Christ, without our merits and works, and in consequence of a lively faith, as also in the certain hope of life eternal, and the true and unfeigned amendment of our lives and conversations through the assistance of the divine spirit to the glory of God the Father, and the edification of our neighbours* (8). As by this inaccurate definition Justification comprehends in it amendment and obedience, so in the explication of this point our authors break in upon the following one which relates to Discipline, and lay down a short summary of moral doctrine, which is contained in a few precepts, and expressed, for the most part, in the language of scripture. There is this peculiarity in their moral injunctions, that they prohibit the taking of oaths and the repelling of injuries. As to what regards Ecclesiastical Discipline, they define it thus: *Ecclesiastical Discipline consists in calling frequently to the remembrance of every individual the duties, that are incumbent upon them, in admonishing, first privately, and afterwards, if this be ineffectual, in a public manner before the whole congregation, such as have sinned openly against God, or offended their neighbour, and, lastly, in excluding from the communion of the church the obstinate and impenitent, that being thus covered with shame they may be led to repentance, or if they remain unconverted may be damned eternally* (9). By their further explication of the point relating to Ecclesiastical Discipline, we see how imperfect and incomplete their notions of that matter were. For they treat in the first place, concerning the government of the church and its ministers, whom they divide into bishops, deacons, elders, and widows. After this, they enumerate, at length, the duties of husbands and wives, old and young, parents and children, masters and servants, citizens and magistrates, poor and rich, and conclude with what relates to the admonishing of offenders, and their exclusion from the communion of the church in case of obstinate impenitence. Their sentiments concerning Prayer are, generally speaking, sound and rational. But in their notion of Baptism they differ from other Christian churches in this, that they make it to consist in immersion or dipping, and emersion or rising again out of the water, and maintain that it ought not to be administered to any, but adult persons. Baptism, say they, is the immersion into water, and the emersion of one who believes in the Gospel and is truly penitent, performed in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or in the name of Jesus Christ alone, by which solemn act the person baptized publicly acknowledgeth, that he is cleansed from all his sins through the mercy of God the Father, by the blood of Christ, and the operation of the Holy Spirit; to the end, that, being ingrafted into the body of Christ, he may mortify the old Adam, and be transformed into the image of the new and heavenly Adam, in the firm assurance of eternal life after the resurrection (10). The last point handled in this performance is the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, of which the authors give an explication, that will be readily adopted by those who embrace the doctrine of ZUINGLE on that head. At the end of this curious Catechism there is a piece, entitled, *Oeconomia Christiana seu Pastoratus Domesticus*, which contains a short instruction to heads of families, shewing them how they ought to proceed in order to maintain and encrease, in their

(7) *Spiritus sanctus est virtus Dei, cujus plenitudinem dedit Deus pater filio suo unigenito, Domino nostro, ut ex ejus plenitudine nos adoptivi acciperemus.*

(8) *Justificatio est, ex mera gratia per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum sine operibus et meritis nostris, omnium præteritorum peccatorum nostrorum in viva fide remissio, vitæque æternæ indubitata expectatio, et auxilio spiritus Dei vitæ nostræ non simulata, sed vera correctio, ad gloriam Dei patris nostri et edificationem proximorum nostrorum.*

(9) *Disciplina ecclesiastica est officii singulorum frequens commemoratio et peccantium contra Deum vel proximum primum privata, deinde etiam publica, coram toto coetu, commonesactio, denique pertinacium a communione sanctorum alienatio, ut pudore suffusi convertantur, aut, si id nolint, æternum damnentur.*

(10) *Baptismus est hominis Evangelio credentis et poenitentiam agentis in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, vel in nomine Jesu Christi in aquam immersio et emersio, quâ publice profitetur, se gratia Dei Patris, in sanguine Christi, opera Spiritus Sancti, ab omnibus peccatis ablutum esse, ut, in corpus Christi insertus, mortificet veterem Adamum et transformetur in Adamum illum coelestem, certus, se post resurrectionem consequuturum esse vitam æternam.*

by the perusal of them, the Arians, who had formerly the upper hand in the community of the Unitarians, were engaged to change their sentiments concerning the nature and mediation of CHRIST [a]. It is true, indeed, that the denomination of *Socinian* was not as yet known. Those, who were afterwards distinguished by this title, passed in *Poland* at the time of which we now speak, under the name of *Anabaptists*, because they admitted to baptism adult persons only, and also re-baptized those that joined them from other Christian churches [b].

XI. The dexterity and perseverance of FAUSTUS SOCINUS gave a new face to the sect of the Unitarians, of which he became the zealous and industrious patron. He was a man of true genius, but of little learning; firm in his purposes and steady in his measures, much inferior in knowledge to his uncle LÆLIUS, while he surpassed him greatly in courage and resolution. This eminent sectary, after having wandered through several countries of *Europe*, settled, in the year 1579, among the Unitarians in *Poland*, and at his arrival there suffered many vexations and much opposition from a considerable number of persons, who looked upon some of his tenets as highly erroneous. And indeed it is evident, that the religious system of FAUSTUS SOCINUS, which he is said to have drawn from the papers of his uncle LÆLIUS, was much less remarkable for its simplicity than that of the Unitarians. He triumphed, however, at last over all the difficulties, that had been laid in his way, by the power of his eloquence, the spirit and

The proceedings
of Faustus Soci-
nus.

houses, a spirit of piety, and in which also their devotion is assisted by forms of prayer composed for morning, evening, and other occasions.

The copy of this Catechism, which is now before me, was given, in the year 1680, by MARTIN CHELMIUS, one of the most eminent and zealous Socinian doctors, to Mr. *Christopher Heiligmeier*, as appears by a long inscription, written by the donor, at the end of the book. In this inscription CHELMIUS promises his friend other productions of the same kind, provided he receives the present one kindly, and concludes with these words of St. PAUL: *God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the strong.*

[a] This appears evidently from the following passage in SCHOMAN's *Testamentum*, (published by SANDIUS, in his *Biblioth. Anti-Trin.*) p. 194. 155. *Sub id fere tempus (A. 1566.) ex Rhapsodiis Lælii Socini quidam fratres didicerunt, Dei filium non esse secundam Trinitatis personam patri coessentialem et coæqualem, sed hominem Jesum Christum, ex Spiritu Sancto conceptum, ex Virgine Maria natum, crucifixum, et resuscitatum: a quibus nos commoniti, sacras litteras perscrutari, persuasi sumus.* These words shew plainly, that the Unitarians or *Pinczovians*, as they were sometimes called, had, before their separation from the Reformed church in the year 1565, believed in a *Trinity* of some kind or other; and had not gone so far as totally to divest JESUS CHRIST of his divinity. SCHOMAN, now cited, was a doctor of great authority in this sect; and he tells us himself, that, at the diet of *Petrikow*, in the year 1565, he defended the unity of God the Father against the Reformed, who maintained the existence of a threefold Deity. We learn nevertheless from himself, that it was not till the year 1566, that a perusal of the papers of LÆLIUS SOCINUS had engaged him to change his sentiments, and to deny the divine personality of Christ. What then are we to conclude from hence? The conclusion is plainly this: that, before the year last mentioned, he and his *Pinczovian* flock, were not Socinians, but Arians only.

[b] This the Unitarians acknowledge in the *Preface* of their *Catechism*, as we have observed above; and it is confirmed by the writer of the *Epistola de Vita Andr. Wiffowatii*, which is subjoined to the *Bibliotheca Anti-Trin.* of SANDIUS. This writer tells us, that his sect were distinguished by the denominations of *Anabaptists* and *Arians*; but that all other Christian communities and individuals in *Poland* were promiscuously called *Chrzesciani*, from the word *Chrześć*, which signifies *Baptism*.

address.

CENT. XVI. address that reigned in his compositions, the elegance and gentleness of his manners, the favour and protection of the nobility which he had acquired by his happy talents and accomplishments, and also by some lucky hits of fortune that favoured his enterprizes. By seizing the occasions when it was prudent to yield, and improving the moments that demanded bold resistance and firm resolution, he stemmed dexterously and courageously the torrent of opposition, and beheld the *Unitarians* submitting to his doctrine, which they had before treated with indignation and contempt. They, in effect, laid aside all feuds and controversies, and formed themselves into one community under his superintendency and direction [c].

The Unitarian religion changed by Socinus.

XII. Thus did Socinus introduce a considerable change into the ancient Unitarian system, which, before his time, was ill digested, ill expressed and chargeable, in many places, with ambiguity and incoherence. He disguised its inconsistencies, gave it an air of connexion, method, and elegance, and defended it with much more dexterity and art, than had ever been discovered by its former patrons [d]. And, accordingly, the affairs of the Unitarians put on a new face. Under the auspicious protection of such a spirited and insinuating chief the little flock, that had been hitherto destitute of strength, resolution, and courage, grew apace, and, all of a sudden, arose to a high degree of credit and influence. Its number was augmented by profelytes of all ranks and orders. Of these some were distinguished by their nobility, others by their opulence, others by their address, and many by their learning and eloquence. All these contributed, in one way or another, to encrease the lustre, and to advance the interests of this rising community and to support it against the multitude of adversaries, which its

[c] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article SOCINUS, tom. iv. p. p. 2741.—SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trin.* p. 64.—SAM. PRZYPCOPII *Vita Socini*, which is prefixed to the works of SOCINUS.—LAMY, *Histoire du Socinianisme*, part. I. ch. xxiv. p. 101, part. II. ch. xxii. p. 375, &c.

[d] Hence it appears, that the modern *Unitarians* are very properly called *Socinians*. For certainly the formation and establishment of that sect were entirely owing to the labours of LÆLIUS and FAUSTUS SOCINUS. The former, indeed, who was naturally timorous and irresolute, died at Zurich, in the year 1562, in the communion of the Reformed church, and seemed unwilling to expose himself to danger, or to sacrifice his repose by founding a new sect, that is, by appearing professedly and openly in this enterprize. Besides: many circumstances concur to render it highly probable, that he did not finish the religious system of which he had formed the plan, but died, on the contrary, in a state of uncertainty and doubt with respect to several points of no small importance. But, notwithstanding all this, he contributed much to the institution of the sect now under consideration. For he collected the materials, that FAUSTUS afterwards digested and employed with such dexterity and success. He secretly and imperceptibly excited doubts and scruples in the minds of many concerning several doctrines generally received among Christians; and, by several arguments against the divinity of Christ, which he left behind him committed to writing, he so far seduced, even after his death, the Arians in Poland, that they embraced the communion and sentiments of those, who looked upon CHRIST as a mere man, created immediately, like ADAM, by God himself. What LÆLIUS had thus begun, FAUSTUS carried on with vigour and finished with success. It is indeed difficult, nay scarcely possible, to determine precisely, what materials he received from his uncle, and what tenets he added, himself; that he added several is plain enough. This difficulty arises from hence, that there are few writings of LÆLIUS extant, and of those that bear his name, some undoubtedly belong to other authors. We learn however from FAUSTUS himself, that the doctrine he propagated, with respect to the person of CHRIST, was, at least the greatest part of it, broached by his uncle LÆLIUS.

remarkable prosperity and success had raised up against it from all quarters? the rich maintained it by their liberality, the powerful by their patronage and protection, and the learned by their writings. But now the system of the *Unitarians*, being thus changed and new modelled, required a new confession of faith to make known its principles, and give a clear and full account of its present state. The ancient *Catechism*, which was no more than a rude and incoherent sketch, was therefore laid aside, and a new form of doctrine was drawn up by *Socinus* himself. This form was corrected by some, augmented by others, and revised by all the Socinian doctors of any note; and, having thus acquired a competent degree of accuracy and perfection, was published under the title of the *Catechism of Racow*, and is still considered as the *Confession of Faith* of the whole sect. An unexpected circumstance crowned all the fortunate events that had happened to this sect, and seemed to leave them nothing further to desire, and this was the zealous protection of *JACOBUS A SIENNO*, to whom *Racow* belonged. This new patron, separating himself from the Reformed church, in the year 1600, embraced the doctrine and communion of the Socinians, and, about two years after, erected in his own city, which he declared their metropolis, a public school, designed as a seminary for their church, to form its ministers and pastors [e].

XIII. From *Poland* the doctrine of *Socinus* made its way into *Transylvania* in the year 1563, and that, principally, by the credit and influence of *GEORGE BLANDRATA*, a celebrated physician, whom *SIGISMUND*, at that time, sovereign of the country, had invited to his court in order to the restoration of his health. *BLANDRATA* was a man of uncommon address, had a deep knowledge of men and things, and was particularly acquainted with the manners, transactions, and intrigues of courts. He had brought with him a Socinian minister, whose name was *FRANCIS DAVID*, who seconded his efforts with such zeal, that by their united solicitations and labours, they engaged the prince and the greatest part of the nobility in their cause, infected almost the whole province with their errors, and obtained for the ministers and members of their communion the privilege of professing and propagating their doctrines in a public manner. The *Batori*, indeed, who were afterwards chosen dukes of *Transylvania*, were, by no means, prejudiced in favour of the Socinians; but that sect was grown so powerful by its numbers and its influence, that they could not, in prudence, attempt to suppress it [f]. Such also was the case with the successors of the *Batori*; they desired ardently to extirpate this society; but never could bring this desire into execution; so that to this very day the Socinians profess their religion publicly in this province, and, indeed, in it alone; and, relying on the protection of the laws and the faith of certain treaties that

The propagation of Socinianism in *Transylvania* and *Hungary*.

[e] See *WISSOWATII Narratio de Separatione Unitariorum a Reformatis*, p. 214.—*LUBIENIUS*, *Histor. Reformat. Polon.* lib. iii. c. xii. p. 240.

[f] See *SANDII Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 28. & 55.—*PAULI DEBREZENI Historia Ecclesie Reformatæ in Hungaria*, p. 147.—*MART. SCHMEIZELII De Statu Eccles. Lutheranae in Transylvania*, p. 55.—*LAMY, Hist. du Socinianisme*, part. I. ch. xiii. p. 46.—*SALIG, Histor. Aug. Confessionis*, vol. ii. lib. vi. cap. vii. p. 847.

CENT. XVI.

have been made with them, have their churches and seminaries of learning, and hold their ecclesiastical and religious assemblies, though exposed to perpetual dangers and snares from the vigilance of their adversaries [g]. About the same time, the Socinians endeavoured to form settlements in Hungary [h] and Austria [i]; but these attempts were happily defeated by the united and zealous opposition both of the Roman Catholic and Reformed churches.

In Holland and
England.

XIV. No sooner had the Socinians obtained a solid and happy settlement at *Racow*, but the dictates of zeal and ambition suggested to them views of a still more extensive nature. Encouraged by the protection of men in power, and the suffrages of men of learning and genius, they began to lay several plans for the enlargement of their community, and meditated nothing less than the propagation of their doctrine through all the states of *Europe*. The first step they took towards the execution of this purpose, was the publication of a considerable number of books, of which some were designed to illustrate and defend their theological system, and others to explain, or rather to pervert, the sacred writings into a conformity with their peculiar tenets. These books, which were composed by the most subtle and artful doctors of the sect, were printed at *Racow*, and dispersed with the utmost industry and zeal through different countries [k]. They also sent missionaries to several places, towards the conclusion of this century, as appears evident from authentic records, in order to make profelytes and to erect new congregations. These missionaries, seemed every way qualified to gain credit to the cause in which they had embarked, as some of them were distinguished by the lustre of their birth, and others by the extent of their learning and the power of their eloquence; and yet, notwithstanding these uncommon advantages, they failed, almost every where, in their attempts. A small congregation was founded at *Dantzic*, which subsisted for some time in a clandestine manner, and then gradually dwindled to nothing [l]. The first attempts to promote the cause of Socinianism in *Holland* were made by a person whose name was ERASMUS JOHANNIS [m]. After him CHRISTOPHER OSTOROD and ANDREW VOIVIODIUS, who were the main pillars of the sect, used their utmost endeavours to gain disciples and followers in that country; nor were their labours wholly unsuccessful, though the zeal of the clergy and the vigilance of the magistrates prevented their forming any regular

[g] GUSTAV. GEORG. ZELTNERI *Historia Crypto-Socinismi Altorfni*, cap. ii. p. 357. 359.

[h] DEBREZENI *Histor. Eccles. Reform. in Hungaria*, p. 169.

[i] HENR. SPONDANI *Continuat. Annal. Baronii, ad A. 1568*, n. xxiv. p. 704.

[k] A considerable number of these books were republished together, in the year 1656, in one great collection, consisting of six volumes *in folio*, under the title of *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*. There are, indeed, in this collection many pieces wanting, which were composed by the most eminent leaders of the sect; but what is there published is, nevertheless, sufficient to give the attentive reader a clear idea of the doctrine of the Socinians, and of the nature of their institution as a religious community.

[l] GUSTAV. GEORG. ZELTNERI *Hist. Crypto-Socinismi Altorfni*, p. 199.

[m] SANDIUS, *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinit.* p. 87.

assemblies, and thus effectually checked their progress [n] and hindered their party from acquiring any considerable degree of strength and stability [o]. Socinianism did not meet with a better reception in *Britain* than in *Holland*. It was introduced into *Germany* by ADAM NEUSER, and other emissaries, who infected the Palatinate with its errors, having entered into a league with the Transylvanians at the critical period, when the affairs of the Unitarians in *Poland* carried a dubious and unpromising aspect. But this pernicious league was soon detected, and the schemes of its authors entirely blasted and disconcerted; upon which NEUSER went into *Turkey*, and enlisted among the Janizaries [p].

XV. Although the Socinians profess to believe that all our knowledge of divine things is derived solely from the Holy Scriptures; yet they maintain, in reality, that the sense of scripture is to be investigated and explained by the dictates of right reason, to which, of consequence, they attribute a great influence in determining the nature and unfolding the various doctrines of religion. When their writings are perused with attention, they will be found to attribute more to reason, in this matter, than most other Christian societies. For they frequently insinuate artfully, nay sometimes declare plainly, that the sacred penmen were guilty of several mistakes, from a defect of memory, as well as a want of capacity: that they expressed their sentiments without either perspicuity or precision, and rendered the plainest things obscure by their pompous and diffuse Asiatic style; and that it was therefore absolutely necessary to employ the lamp of human reason to cast a light upon their doctrine, and to explain it in a manner conformable to truth. It is easy to see what they had in view by maintaining propositions of this kind. They aimed at nothing less than the establishment of the following general rule, viz. that the history of the Jews, and of JESUS CHRIST was indeed to be derived from the books of the *Old* and *New Testament*, and that it was not lawful to entertain the least doubt concerning the truth of this history, and the authenticity of these books in general; but that the particular doctrines, which they contain, were, nevertheless, to be understood and explained in such a manner as to render them conformable to the dictates of reason. According to this representation of things, it is not the Holy Scripture, which declares clearly, and expressly, what we are to believe concerning the nature, counsels, and perfections of the Deity; but it is

The main principle of Socinianism.

[n] The learned and judicious BRANDT, in his *History of the Reformation of the Netherlands*, tells us, that OSTOROD and VOIDIOVIUS were banished, and that their books were condemned to be burnt publicly by the hands of the common hangman. Accordingly the pile was raised, the executioner approached, and the multitude was assembled, but the books did not appear. The magistrates, who were curious to peruse their contents, had quietly divided them among themselves and their friends.]

[o] ZELTNERUS, *Hist. Crypto-Socinismi*, &c. p. 31. & 178.

[p] BURCH. GOTT. STRUVII *Hist. Eccles. Palat.* cap. viii. § liii. p. 214.—ALTING. *Hist. Eccles. Palat.* in MIEGII *Monum. Palat.* p. 266—337.—LA CROZE, *Dissertationes Historiques*, tom. i. p. 101. 127. compared with BERN. RAUPACHIIUS, his *Presbyterologia Austriaca*, p. 113. where there is an account of JOHN MATTHÆUS, who was concerned in these troubles.

CENT. XVI. human reason, which shews us the system of religion that we ought to seek in, and deduce from, the divine oracles.

The dangerous consequences of this principle.

XVI. This fundamental principle of Socinianism will still appear more dangerous and pernicious, when we consider the sense in which the word *Reason* was understood by this sect. The pompous title of *Right Reason* was given, by the Socinians, to that measure of intelligence and discernment, or in other words, to that faculty of comprehending and judging which we derive from nature. According to this definition, the fundamental rule of the Socinians necessarily supposes, that no doctrine ought to be acknowledged as true in its nature or divine in its origin, all whose parts are not level to the comprehension of the human understanding, and that, whatever the Holy Scriptures teach concerning the perfections of God, his counsels and decrees, and the way of salvation, must be modified, curtailed and filed down, in such a manner, by the transforming power of art and argument, as to answer the extent of our limited faculties. Those who adopt this singular rule, must, at the same time, grant that the number of religions must be nearly equal to that of individuals. For as there is a great variety in the talents and capacities of different persons, so what will appear difficult and abstruse to one, will seem evident and clear to another, and thus the more discerning and penetrating will adopt as divine truth what the slow and superficial will look upon as unintelligible jargon. This consequence does not, at all, alarm the Socinians, who suffer their members to explain in very different ways many doctrines of the highest importance, and permit every one to follow his particular fancy in composing his theological system, provided they acknowledge, in general, the truth and authenticity of the history of CHRIST, and adhere to the precepts, the Gospel lays down for the regulation of our lives and actions.

The sum and substance of Socinianism.

XVII. In consequence of this leading maxim the Socinians either reject without exception, or change and accommodate to their limited capacities, all those doctrines relating to the nature of God and of JESUS CHRIST, the plan of redemption and the eternal rewards and punishments unfolded in the Gospel, which they either cannot comprehend or consider as attended with considerable difficulties. The sum of their theology is as follows:
 “ God, who is infinitely more perfect than man, though of a similar nature
 “ in some respects, exerted an act of that power by which he governs all
 “ things, in consequence of which an extraordinary person was born of the
 “ Virgin MARY. That person was JESUS CHRIST, whom God first trans-
 “ lated to heaven by that portion of his divine power, which is called the
 “ *Holy Ghost*, and having instructed him fully there in the knowledge of his
 “ will, counsels, and designs, sent him again into this sublunary world to
 “ promulgate to mankind a new rule of life, more excellent than that under
 “ which they had formerly lived, to propagate divine truth by his ministry,
 “ and to confirm it by his death.

“ Those who obey the voice of this Divine Teacher, (and this obedience
 “ is in the power of every one whose will and inclination leads that way)
 “ shall, one day, be cloathed with new bodies, and inhabit eternally those
 “ blessed

“blessed regions, where God, himself, immediately resides. Such, on the contrary, as are disobedient and rebellious, shall undergoe most terrible and exquisite torments, which shall be succeeded by annihilation, or the total extinction of their being.”

The whole system of Socinianism, when stripped of the embellishments and commentaries with which it has been loaded and disguised by its doctors, is really reducible to the few propositions now mentioned.

XVIII. The nature and genius of the Socinian theology has an immediate influence upon the moral system of that sect, and naturally leads its doctors, to confine their rules of morality and virtue to the *external* actions and duties of life. On the one hand, they deny the influence of a divine spirit and power upon the minds of men; and, on the other, they acknowledge, that no mortal has such an empire over himself as to be able to suppress or extinguish his sinful propensities and corrupt desires. Hence they have no conclusion left, but one, and that is to declare all such true and worthy Christians whose *words* and *external actions* are conformable to the precepts of the Divine law. It is, at the same time, remarkable, that another branch of their doctrine leads directly to the utmost severity in what relates to life and manners, since they maintain that the great end of CHRIST's mission upon earth was to exhibit to mortals a new law, distinguished from all others by its unblemished sanctity and perfection. Hence it is, that a great number of the Socinians have fallen into the fanatical rigour of the ancient Anabaptists, and judged it absolutely unlawful to repel injuries, to take oaths, to inflict capital punishments on malefactors, to oppose the despotic proceedings of tyrannical magistrates, to acquire wealth by honest industry, and other things of that nature. But, in this, there is something extremely singular, and they are here, indeed, inconsistent with themselves. For while, in matters of doctrine, they take the greatest liberty with the expressions of scripture, and pervert them in a violent manner to the defence of their peculiar tenets, they proceed quite otherwise, when they come to prescribe rules of conduct from the precepts of the Gospel; for then they understand these precepts literally and apply them without the least distinction of times, persons, and circumstances.

The moral doctrine of the Socinians.

XIX. It must carefully be observed, that the *Catechism of Racow*, which most people look upon as the great standard of Socinianism, and as an accurate summary of the doctrine of that sect, is, in reality, no more than a collection of the popular tenets of the Socinians, and, by no means, a just representation of the secret opinions and sentiments of their doctors [q]. The writings, therefore, of these learned men must be perused, with attention, in order to our knowing the hidden reasons and true principles from whence the doctrines of the Catechism are derived. It is observable, besides, that,

The Catechism of Racow.

[q] We have an account of the authors of this famous *Catechism*, and of the various success it met with, in the *Commentatio de Catechesi Racovienfi*, published by JO. AND. SCHMIDIUS in the year 1707. See also KORCHEIRI *Biblioth. Theolog. Symbolicæ*.—A new edition of the *Catechism* itself, with a solid refutation of the doctrine it contains, was published in 8^{vo} at Frankfort and Leipzig, in the year 1739, by the learned GEORGE LEWIS OEDER.

in:

CENT. XVI. in this Catechism, many Socinian tenets and institutions, which might have contributed to render the sect still more odious, and to expose its internal constitution too much to public view, are entirely omitted; so that it seems to have been less composed for the use of the Socinians themselves, than to impose upon strangers and to mitigate the indignation which the tenets of this community had excited in the minds of many [r]. Hence it never obtained among the Socinians the authority of a public confession or rule of faith; and hence the doctors of that sect were authorised to correct and contradict it, or to substitute another form of doctrine in its place. It is also observable, that the most eminent writers and patrons of the Socinians give no clear or consistent account of the sentiments of that sect in relation to ecclesiastical discipline and government, and the form of public worship. All that we know is, that they follow in these matters, generally speaking, the customs received in the protestant churches [s].

The state of
learning among
the Socinians.

XX. The first founders and patrons of this sect were eminently distinguished by their learning and genius. Their successors, however, did not follow their steps in this respect, nor keep up the reputation they had universally obtained. The *Unitarians* in *Poland* seem to have had little ambition of science. They gave no encouragement to learning or talents; and appeared little solicitous of having in their community subtle doctors and learned disputants. But when they perceived, on the one hand, that the success of their community required as able defenders, as they had learned and ingenious adversaries, and were so lucky, on the other, as to obtain the privilege of erecting seminaries of learning at *Racow* and *Lublin*, they then changed their sentiments with respect to this matter, and became sensible of the necessity under which they lay to encourage in their community a zeal for the sciences. This zeal increased greatly from the time that *FAUSTUS SOCINUS* undertook the restoration of their declining credit, and put himself at the head of their tottering sect. At that time many persons, distinguished by their birth, education and talents, embraced its doctrine, and contributed to promote the love of science among its members. Then the youth were taught the rules of eloquence and rhetorick, and instructed in the important branches of Oriental, Greek, and Latin literature. Nay, even the secret paths of philosophy were opened, though their treasures were disclosed only to a few, who were selected, for that purpose, from the multitude. The *Racovian* doctors, in compliance with the spirit and taste of the age, chose *ARISTOTLE* as their guide in philosophy, as appears evidently from the *Ethics* of *CRELLIUS*, and other literary records of these times.

[r] This appears evidently enough from their presenting a Latin translation of this Catechism to *JAMES I.*, king of *Great Britain*, and a German one to the academy of *Wittemberg*.

[s] This is manifest from a work composed by *PETER MORSCOVIVS*, or *MORSCOWSKY*, under the following title: *Politia Ecclesiastica, quam vulgo Agenda vocant, sive forma Regiminis exterioris Ecclesiarum Christianarum in Polonia, quæ unum Deum Patrem, per filium ejus Unigenitum in Spiritu Sancto continentur.* This work, which is divided into three books, was composed in the year 1642, and published in 4^{to} at *Nuremberg*, but a few years ago, by the learned *GEORGE LEWIS OEDER*. It is mentioned by *SANDIUS*, in his *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 142. who says that it was drawn up for the use of the *Belgic* churches.

XXI. Not-

XXI. Notwithstanding this progress of philosophy among the Socinians, CIVIL. XVD. their doctors seemed to reject its succours in theology with obstinacy and disdain. They declare in numberless places of their writings, that both in the interpretation of scripture and in explaining and demonstrating the truths of religion in general, clearness and simplicity are alone to be consulted, and no regard paid to the subtilties of philosophy and Logic. And indeed, had their doctors and interpreters followed, in practice, this rule that they have laid down with so much ostentation, in theory, they would have saved their adversaries and perhaps themselves much trouble. But this is, by no means, the case. For in the greatest part of their theological productions, their pretended simplicity is frequently accompanied with much subtilty and with the most refined intricacies of scientific art. And, what is still more inexcusable, they reason with the greatest dexterity and acuteness concerning those subjects, which (as they surpass the reach of the human understanding) are generally received, among other Christians, as *facts* confirmed by the most respectable testimony, and consequently as matters of pure faith, while they discover little sagacity, or strength of judgment in those discussions which are within the sphere of reason, and are properly amenable to its tribunal. They are acute where they ought to be silent, and they reason awkwardly where sagacity and argument are required. These are certainly great inconsistencies; yet they proceed from one and the same principle, even the maxim, universally received in this community: that all things *that surpass the limits of human comprehension are to be entirely banished from the Christian religion.*

Their method of proceeding in theology.

XXII. It has been already observed, that the Unitarians had no sooner separated themselves from the Reformed churches in Poland, than they became a prey to intestine divisions, and were split into several factions. The points of doctrine that gave rise to these divisions, related to the dignity of CHRIST's nature and character, the lawfulness of *Infant-Baptism*, the personality of the *Holy Ghost*, to which were added several alterations concerning the duties of life, and the rules of conduct that were obligatory on Christians. The sects, produced by these divisions, were not all equally obstinate. Some of them entertained pacific dispositions, and seemed inclined towards a reconciliation. But two particularly maintained tenaciously their sentiments, and persisted in their separation; these were the *Budnæans* and the *Farnovians*. The former were so called from their leader SIMON BUDNÆUS, a man of considerable acuteness and sagacity, who, more dexterous than the rest of his brethren in deducing consequences from their principles, and perceiving plainly the conclusions to which the peculiar principles of LÆLIUS SOCINUS naturally led, denied flatly all kinds of religious worship to JESUS CHRIST. Nor did BUDNÆUS stop here; in order to give a more specious colour to this capital error, and to maintain it upon consistent grounds, he asserted that CHRIST was not begotten by an extraordinary act of Divine power, but that he was born, like other men, in a natural way. This hypothesis, however conformable to the fundamental principles of

The divisions of the Socinians and their intestine controversies—
Budnæans.

CENT. XVI. of Socinianism, appeared intolerable and impious to the greatest part of that community. Hence BUDNÆUS, who had gained over to his doctrine a great number of Profelytes in *Lithuania* and *Russian Poland*, was deposed from his ministerial functions in the year 1584, and publicly excommunicated with all his disciples. It is said, however, that he afterwards abandoned his peculiar and offensive sentiments, and was again re-admitted to the communion of that sect [t].

The sentiments
of Budnæus em-
braced by Davides
and Francken.

XXIII. This heretical doctrine, which had created so much trouble to BUDNÆUS, was soon after adopted by FRANCIS DAVIDES, a Hungarian, who was the superintendent of the Socinian churches in *Transylvania*, and who opposed with the greatest ardor and obstinacy the custom of offering up prayers and divine worship to JESUS CHRIST. Several methods were used to reclaim him from this offensive error. BLANDRATA employed all the power of his eloquence for this purpose, and, to render his remonstrances still more effectual, sent for FAUSTUS SOCINUS, who went accordingly into *Transylvania* in the year 1573, and seconded his arguments and exhortations with the utmost zeal and perseverance. But DAVIDES remained unmoved, and was, in consequence of this obstinate adherence to his error, thrown into prison by CHRISTOPHER BATHORY, prince of *Transylvania*; where he died, in the year 1579, in an advanced age [u]. This his unhappy fate did not, however, extinguish the controversy to which his doctrine had given rise. For he left behind him disciples and friends who strenuously maintained his sentiments, stood firm against the opposition that was made to them, and created much uneasiness to SOCINUS and his followers in *Lithuania* and *Poland*. The most eminent of these were JACOB PALÆOLOGUS of the isle of *Cbio*, who was burnt at *Rome* in the year 1585; CHRISTIAN FRANCKEN, who had disputed, in person, with SOCINUS; and JOHN SOMMER [w], who was master of the academy of *Clausenburg* [x]. This little sect is branded by the Socinian writers with the ignominious appellation of *Semi-Judaizers* [y].

[t] See SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 54, 55.—*Epistola de Vita Wiffowatii*, p. 226.—RINGELTAUBE'S *German Dissertation on the Polish Bibles*, p. 144. 152.—SAMUEL CRELLIUS, the most learned Socinian of our times, looks upon ADAM NEUSER *, who was banished on account of his erroneous sentiments, to have been the author of this doctrine, which is so derogatory from the dignity of JESUS CHRIST. See CRELLII *Thesaur. Epistol. Crozian.* tom. i. p. 111.

[u] SANDIUS, *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 55, 56.—FAUST. SOCIN. *Oper.* tom. i. p. 353. 395. tom. ii. p. 713. 771. where there is an account of his conference and dispute with FRANCIS DAVIDES.—STAN. LUBIENIECHII *Histor. Reform. Polonicae*, lib. iii. c. xi. p. 228.

[w] See SANDIUS *loc. cit.* p. 57, 58. The dispute between SOCINUS and FRANCKEN is related, at large, in the *Works* of the former, tom. ii. p. 767.

[x] *Clausenburg*, otherwise *Coloswar*, is a town in *Transylvania*, extremely populous and well fortified. The Socinians have here a public school, and a printing-house; and their community in this place is very numerous. Till the year 1603, they were in possession of the cathedral, which was then taken from them and given to the Jesuits, whose college and church they had pulled down.]

[y] FAUSTUS SOCINUS wrote a particular Treatise against the *Semi-Judaizers*, which is pub-

* See § xiv. of this chapter.

XXIV. The

XXIV. The *Farnovians* were treated by the Socinians with much more indulgence. They were neither excluded from the communion of the sect, nor obliged to renounce their peculiar tenets; they were only exhorted to conceal them prudently, and not to publish or propagate them in their discourses from the pulpit [z]. This particular branch of the Socinian community was so called from STANISLAUS FARNOVIUS, or FARNESIUS, who was engaged by GONESIUS to prefer the Arian system to that of the Socinians, and consequently asserted that CHRIST had been engendred or produced, out of nothing, by the supreme Being before the creation of this terrestrial globe. It is not so easy to say, what his sentiments were concerning the *Holy Ghost*; all we know of that matter, is, that he warned his disciples against paying the tribute of religious worship to that Divine Spirit [a]. FARNOVIUS separated from the other *Unitarians*, in the year 1568, and was followed, in this schism, by several persons eminent on account of the extent of their learning, and the influence of their rank, such as MARTIN CZECHOVICIUS, NIEMOIOVIUS, STANISLAUS WISNOWIUS, JOHN FALCON, GEORGE SCHOMAN, and others. They did not, however, form themselves into a stable or permanent sect. The lenity and indulgence of the Socinians, together with the dexterity of their disputants, brought many

CENT. XVI.

The Farnovian sect.

blished in the second volume of his Works, p. 804. It is, however, worthy of observation, that the motive which engaged SOCINUS and his friends to employ so much pains and labour in the suppression of this faction, was not a persuasion of the pernicious tendency of its doctrines or peculiar notions. On the contrary, SOCINUS himself expressly acknowledges, that this controversy turns upon matters of very little importance, by declaring it, as his opinion, that praying, or offering up divine worship to CHRIST, is not necessary to salvation. Thus, in his answer to *Wujek*, (*Opp. tom. ii. p. 538.*) he expresses himself in the following manner: *The Christian, whose faith is so great, as to encourage him to make his addresses habitually and directly to the supreme Being, and who standeth not in need of the comfort that flows from the invocation of CHRIST, his brother, who was tempted in all things like as he is, that Christian is not obliged to call upon the name of Jesus, by prayer or supplication* *. According therefore to the opinion of SOCINUS, those who lay aside all regard to CHRIST as an Intercessor, and address themselves directly to God alone, have a greater measure of faith than others. But, if this be so, why did he oppose with such vehemence and animosity the sentiment of DAVIDES, who, in effect, did no more than exhort all Christians to address themselves directly and immediately to the Father? Here there appears to be a striking inconsistency. We find also LUBIENIECIUS, in his *Hist. Reformat. Polonicæ*, lib. iii. cap. xi. p. 228. speaking lightly enough of this controversy, and representing it as a matter of very little moment, whence he says, that in *Transylvania* there was much ado about nothing †. From all this, then, it appears manifest, that SOCINUS and his followers were more artful than ingenuous in their proceedings with respect to DAVIDES. They persecuted him and his followers, lest by tolerating his doctrine, they should increase the odium under which they already lay, and draw upon themselves anew the resentment of other Christian churches, while, in their private judgment, they looked upon this very doctrine and its professors as worthy of toleration and indulgence.

[z] *Epistola de Vita Wiffowatii*, p. 226.—ERASMUS JOHANNIS (as we are informed by SANDIUS *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 87.) was admitted Professor of Divinity in the Socinian academy at *Clausenburg*, on condition, that in his public discourses he should never say any thing of CHRIST's having existed before the Virgin MARY.

[a] SANDIUS *Biblioth.* p. 52. & passim.

* *Quod si quis, tanta est fide præditus, ut ad Deum ipsum perpetuo recta accedere audeat, nec consolatione, quæ ex Christi Fratris sui per omnia tentati invocatione proficiscitur, indigeat, hic non opus habet, ut Christum invocet.*

† *Fluctus in simpulo excitatos esse.*

CENT. XVI. of them back into the bosom of the community they had deserted, and considerable numbers were dispersed or regained by the prudence and address of FAUSTUS SOCINUS. So that, at length, the whole faction, being deprived of its chief, who died in the year 1615, was scattered abroad, and reduced to nothing [b].

[b] We omit here an enumeration of the more famous Socinian writers who flourished in this century, because the greatest part of them have already been mentioned in the course of this History. The rest may be easily collected from SANDIUS.

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

SECTION I.

The GENERAL HISTORY of the CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

I. **T**HE arduous attempts made by the pontiffs, in the preceding century, to advance the glory and majesty of the see of *Rome*, by extending the limits of the Christian church and spreading the Gospel through the distant nations, met with much opposition; and as they were neither well conducted nor properly supported, their fruits were neither abundant nor permanent. But in this century the same attempts were renewed with vigour, crowned with success, and contributed not a little to give a new degree of stability to the tottering grandeur of the papacy. They were begun by GREGORY XV, who, by the advice of his confessor NARNI, founded at *Rome*, in the year 1622, the famous *Congregation for the propagation of the faith*, and enriched it with ample revenues. This congregation, which consists of thirteen cardinals, two priests, one monk, and a secretary [a], is designed to propagate and maintain the religion of *Rome* in all parts and corners of the world. Its riches and possessions were so prodigiously augmented by the munificence of URBAN VIII, and the liberality of an incredible number of donors, that its funds are, at this day, adequate to the most expensive and magnificent undertakings. And, indeed, the enterprizes of this *Congregation* are great and extensive. By it a vast number of missionaries are sent to the remotest parts of the world; books of various kinds published to facilitate the study of foreign and barbarous languages; the sacred writings and other pious productions sent abroad to the most distant corners of the globe, and exhibited to each nation and country in their own language and characters; seminaries founded for the sustenance

CENT. XVII.

The College de
propaganda fide
founded at Rome.

[a] Such is the number of members belonging to this *Congregation* as they stand in the original Bull of GREGORY XV; see *Bullarium Roman.* tom. iii. p. 472. edit. *Luxemburg*.—CERRI mentions the same number in his *État Present de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 259. But a different account is given by AYMON, in his *Tableau de la Cour de Rome*, part. III. cap. iii. p. 279. for he makes this *Congregation* to consist of eighteen cardinals, one of the pope's secretaries, one apostolical protobnotary, one referendary, and one of the assessors, or secretaries of the inquisition.

CENT. XVII.

and education of a prodigious number of young men set apart for the foreign missions; houses erected for the instruction and support of the Pagan youths that are yearly sent from abroad to *Rome*, that they may return from thence into their respective countries, and become the instructors of their blinded Brethren; not to mention the charitable establishments that are designed for the relief and support of those, who have suffered banishment or been involved in other calamities on account of their steadfast attachment to the religion of *Rome* and their zeal for promoting the glory of its pontif. Such are the arduous and complicated schemes, with the execution of which this congregation is charged; but these, though the principal, are not the only objects of its attention; its views, in a word, are vast, and its exploits almost incredible. Its members hold their assemblies in a splendid and magnificent palace, whose delightful situation adds a singular lustre to its beauty and grandeur [b].

The College *pro*
propaganda &c.
instituted by
Urban VIII.

II. To this famous establishment another, less magnificent, indeed, but highly useful, was added, in the year 1627, by pope URBAN VIII, under the denomination of a *College* or *Seminary for the propagation of the faith*. This seminary is set apart for the instruction and education of those who are designed for the foreign missions; and they are here brought up, with the greatest care, in the knowledge of all the languages and sciences, that are necessary to prepare them for propagating the Gospel among the distant nations. This excellent foundation was due to the zeal and munificence of JOHN BAPTIST VILES, a Spanish nobleman, who resided at the court of *Rome*, and who began by presenting to the pontif all his ample possessions together with his house, which was a noble and beautiful structure, for this pious and generous purpose. His liberality excited a spirit of pious emulation, and is followed with zeal even to this day. The *Seminary* was at first committed by URBAN to the care and direction of three *canons* of the *patriarchal* churches; but this disposition was afterwards changed, and, ever since the year 1641, it is governed by the *Congregation*, founded by GREGORY XV [c].

Congregations
and Colleges of
the same nature
founded in
France.

III. The same zealous spirit reached *France*, and produced there several pious foundations of a like nature. In the year 1663, the *Congregation of priests of the foreign missions* was instituted by royal authority, while an association of bishops and other ecclesiastics founded the *Parisian Seminary for the missions abroad*, designed for the education of those who were set apart for the propagation of Christianity among the Pagan nations. From hence, apostolical vicars are still sent to *Siam*, *Tonquin*, *Cochin China*, and *Persia*, bishops to *Babylon*, and missionaries to other Asiatic nations, and all these

[b] The authors, who have given an account of this Congregation, are mentioned by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toti orbi exorians*, cap. xxxiii. p. 566. Add to these DOROTHEUS ASCANIUS, *De Montibus Pietatis Ecclesiæ Romanæ*. p. 522. where there is a compleat list of the books that have been published by this Congregation from its first institution until the year 1667.

[c] HELYOT, *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques, Religieux et Militaires*, tom. viii. cap. xii. p. 78. URB. CERRI *État présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 293. where, however, the first founder of this College is called, by mistake, VIVES.

spiritual envoys are supported by the ample revenues and possessions of the *CENT. XVII.* *Congregation and Seminary* [d]. These *priests of the foreign missions* [e], and the apostles they send into foreign countries, are almost perpetually involved in altercations and debates with the Jesuits and their missionaries. The former are shocked at the methods that are ordinarily employed by the latter in converting the Chinese and other Asiatics to the Christian religion. And the Jesuits, in their turn, absolutely refuse obedience to the orders of the *apostolical vicars and bishops*, who receive their commission from the *Congregation* above-mentioned; though this commission be issued out with the consent of the pope, or of the *College de propaganda fide* residing at Rome. There was also another religious establishment formed in France, during this century, under the title of the *Congregation of the Holy Sacrament*, whose founder was AUTHERIUS, bishop of *Bethlehem*, and which, in the year 1644, received an order from URBAN VIII to have always a number of ecclesiastics ready to exercise their ministry among the Pagan nations, whenever they should be called upon by the pope or the *Congregation de propaganda* for that purpose [f]. It would be endless to mention other associations of less note, that were formed in several countries, for promoting the cause of Christianity among the darkened nations, as also the care taken by the Jesuits and other religious communities to have a number of missionaries always ready for that purpose.

IV. These congregations and colleges sent forth those legions of missionaries, who, in this century, covered, in a manner, the whole face of the globe, and converted, to the profession of Christianity at least, if not to its temper and spirit, multitudes of persons in the fiercest and most barbarous nations. The religious orders, that make the greatest figure in these missions are the *Jesuits*, the *Dominicans*, the *Franciscans*, and the *Capuchins*, who, though concerned in one common cause, agree, nevertheless, very ill among themselves, accusing each other publicly and reciprocally, and that with the most bitter reproaches and invectives, of want of zeal in the service of CHRIST, nay of corrupting the purity of the Christian doctrine to promote their ambitious purposes. But none are so universally accused of sinister views and unworthy practices, in this respect, as the *Jesuits*, who are singularly odious in the eyes of all the other missionaries, and are looked upon as a very dangerous and pernicious set of apostles by a considerable part of the Romish church. Nor, indeed, can they be viewed in any other light, if the general report be true, that, instead of instructing their proselytes in the genuine doctrines of Christianity, they teach them a corrupt system of religion and morality that sits easy upon their consciences, and is reconcileable with the indulgence of their appetites and passions; — that they not only tolerate, but even countenance in these new converts several prophane opinions and superstitious rites and customs; — that by commerce, carried

Missionaries multiply, more especially those of the Jesuits.

[d] See the *Gallia Christiana Benedictinorum*, tom. vii. p. 1024. — HELYOT, *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques*, tom. viii. cap. xii. p. 84.

[e] These ecclesiastics are commonly called in France *Messieurs des Missions Etrangères*.

[f] HELYOT *loc. cit.* cap. xiii. p. 87. 100.

CENT. XVII. on with the most rapacious avidity, and various other methods little consistent with probity and candour, they have already acquired an overgrown opulence which they augment from day to day; — that they burn with the thirst of ambition, and are constantly gaping after worldly honours and prerogatives; — that they are perpetually employing the arts of adulation and the seductions of bribery to insinuate themselves into the friendship and protection of men in power; — that they are deeply involved in civil affairs, in the cabals of courts and the intrigues of politicians; — and finally, that they frequently excite intestine commotions and civil wars in those states and kingdoms, where their views are obstructed or disappointed, and refuse obedience to the Roman pontif and to the vicars and bishops that bear his commission. These accusations are indeed grievous, but they are perfectly well attested, being confirmed by the most striking circumstantial evidence, as well as by a prodigious number of unexceptionable witnesses. Among these we may reckon many of the most illustrious and respectable members of the church of *Rome*, whose testimony cannot be imputed to the suggestions of envy, on the one hand, nor considered as the effect of temerity or ignorance on the other; such are the cardinals, the members of the *Congregation de propaganda fide*, and even some of the popes themselves. These testimonies are supported and confirmed by glaring facts, even by the proceedings of the Jesuits in *China*, *Abyssinia*, *Japan*, and *India*, where they have dishonoured the cause of Christianity, and hurt the interests of *Rome* in the most sensible manner by their corrupt practices [g].

The Jesuits ill-looked upon.

V. The Jesuits exhausted all the resources of their peculiar artifice and dexterity to impose silence upon their accusers, to confound their adversaries, and to give a specious colour to their own proceedings. But all their stratagems were ineffectual. The court of *Rome* was informed of their odious frauds; and this information was, by no means, looked upon as groundless. Many circumstances concur to prove this, and among others the conduct of the Congregation at *Rome*, by which the foreign missions are carried on and directed. For it is remarkable, that, during many years past, the Jesuits have been much less employed, by that Congregation, than in former times, and are also treated, on, almost, every occasion, with a degree of circumspection that manifestly implies suspicion and diffidence. Other religious orders have evidently gained the ascendant they formerly held, and, in the nice and critical affairs of the church, and more especially in what relates to the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts, much more confidence is placed in the austere sobriety, poverty, industry, and patience of the *Capuchins* and *Carmelites* than in the opulence, artifice, genius, and fortitude of the disciples of *LOVOLA*. On the other hand it is certain, that if the Jesuits are not much trusted, they are, however, more or less feared; since neither the powerful *Congregation*, now mentioned, nor even the Roman pontifs, themselves, venture to reform all the abuses, which

[g] The reader will find an ample relation of these facts supported by a cloud of witnesses in the Preface to the *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jesus*, published at *Utrecht* in the year 1741.

they silently disapprove or openly blame in the conduct of this insidious CENT. XVII.
 Order. This connivance, however involuntary, is become a matter of necessity. The opulence of the Jesuits is so excessive, and their credit and influence are grown so extensive and formidable in all those parts of the world that embrace the religion of *Rome*, that they carry their insolence so far as to menace often the pontif on his throne, who cannot, without the utmost peril, oblige them to submit to his Orders where they are disposed to be refractory. Nay more: the decisions of the pope are frequently suggested by this powerful society, and it is only in such a case that the society treats them with unlimited respect. When they come from any other quarter, they are received, in a very different manner, by the Jesuits, who trample upon some of them with impunity, and interpret others with their usual dexterity in such a manner, as to answer the views and promote the interests of their ambitious order. Such, at least, are the accounts that are generally given of their proceedings; accounts which, though contradicted by them, are, nevertheless, supported by striking and palpable evidence.

VI. The rise of these dissensions between the Jesuits and the other Roman missionaries is owing to the methods of conversion used by the former, which are entirely different from those that are employed by the latter. The crafty disciples of *LOYOLA* judge it proper to attack the superstition of the *Indian* nations by artifice and stratagem, and to bring them only gradually with the utmost caution and prudence, to the knowledge of Christianity. In consequence of this principle, they interpret and explain the ancient doctrines of Paganism, and also those that *CONFUCIUS* taught in *China*, in such a manner as to soften and diminish, at least in appearance, their opposition to the truths of the Gospel; and whenever they find, in any of the religious systems of the Indians, tenets or precepts that bear even the faintest resemblance of certain doctrines or precepts of Christianity, they employ all their dexterity and zeal to render this resemblance more plausible and striking, and to persuade the Indians that there is a great conformity between their ancient theology and the new religion, they are exhorted to embrace. They go still further. For they indulge their proselytes in the observance of all their national customs and rites, except such as are glaringly inconsistent with the genius and spirit of the Christian worship. These rites are modified a little by the Jesuits, and are directed towards a different set of objects, so as to form a sort of coalition between Paganism and Christianity. To secure themselves an ascendant over the untutored minds of these simple Indians, they study their natural inclinations and propensities, comply with them, on all occasions, and carefully avoid whatever may shock them. And as in all countries the clergy and men of eminent learning are supposed to have a considerable influence on the multitude, so the Jesuits are particularly assiduous in courting the friendship of the Indian priests, which they obtain by various methods, in the choice of which they are far from being scrupulous. But the protection of men in power is the great object they principally aim at, as the surest method of establishing their authority, and extending their influence. And hence they study all the arts
 that

The methods of
 converting prac-
 tised by the
 Jesuits procure
 them enemies.

CENT. XVII. that can render them agreeable or useful to great men; hence their application to the mathematics, physick, poetry, to the theory of painting, sculpture, architecture, and the other elegant arts; and hence their perseverance in studying men and manners, the interests of princes, and the affairs of the world, in order to prepare them for giving counsel in critical situations, and suggesting expedients in perplexing and complicated cases. It would be endless to enumerate all the abuses, that have been complained of in the proceedings of the Jesuits. These, that have been now mentioned, have ruined their credit in the esteem of the other missionaries, who consider their artful and insidious dealings, as every way unsuitable to the character and dignity of the ambassadors of CHRIST, whom it becomes to plead the cause of God with an honest simplicity, and an ingenuous openness and candour, without any mixture of dissimulation or fraud. And, accordingly, we find the other religious orders, that are employed in the foreign missions, proceeding in a very different method in the exercise of their ministry. They attack openly the superstitions of the Indians in all their connexions and in all their consequences, and are studious to remove whatever may seem adapted to nourish them. They shew little regard to the ancient rites and customs, in use among the blinded nations, and little respect for the authority of those by whom they were established. They treat with a certain indifference and contempt the Pagan priests, grandees, and princes, and preach, without disguise, the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, while they attack, without hesitation or fear, the superstitions of those nations they are called to convert.

Christianity propagated in India.

VII. These missionaries of the court of Rome spread the fame of the Christian religion through the greatest part of Asia during this century. To begin with *India*; it is observable, that the ministerial labours of the *Jesuits*, *Theatins*, and *Augustinians* contributed to introduce some rays of divine truth, mixed, indeed, with much darkness and superstition, into those parts of that vast region, that had been possessed by the Portuguese before their expulsion from thence by the Dutch. But of all the missions, that were established in these distant parts of the globe, none has been more constantly and universally applauded than that of *Madura*, and none is said to have produced more abundant and permanent fruit. It was undertaken and executed by ROBERT DE NOBILI [b], an Italian Jesuit, who took a very singular method of rendering his ministry successful. Considering, on the one hand, that the Indians beheld with an eye of prejudice and aversion all the Europeans, and, on the other, that they held in the highest veneration the order of *Brachmans* as descended from the Gods; and, that, impatient of other rulers, they paid an implicit and unlimited obedience to them alone, he assumed the appearance and title of a *Brachman*, that had come from a far country, and by besmearing his countenance and imitating that most austere and painful method of living, that the *Sanianes* or Penitents observe, he, at length, persuaded the credulous people that he was, in reality, a

[b] Others call this famous missionary ROBERT DE NOBILIBUS.

member of that venerable Order [i]. By this stratagem he gained over to Christianity twelve eminent Brachmans, whose example and influence engaged a prodigious number of the people to hear the instructions, and to receive the doctrine of this famous missionary. On the death of ROBERT this singular mission was for some time at a stand; and seemed even to be neglected [k]. But it was afterwards renewed by the zeal and industry of the Portuguese Jesuits, and is still carried on by several missionaries, of that Order, from *France* and *Portugal*, who have inured themselves to the terrible austerities, that were practised by ROBERT, and that are thus become, as it were, the appendages of that mission. These fictitious *Brachmans*, who boldly deny their being Europeans or *Franks* [l], and only give themselves out for inhabitants of the northern regions, are said to have converted a prodigious number of Indians to Christianity; and, if common report may be trusted to, the congregations they have already founded in those countries, grow larger and more numerous from year to year. Nor, indeed, do these accounts appear, in the main, unworthy of credit [m]; though we must not

[i] URBAN CERRI *État présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 173.

[NOBILI, who is looked upon by the Jesuits as the chief apostle of the Indians after FRANÇOIS XAVIER, took incredible pains to acquire a knowledge of the religion, customs, and language of *Madura*, sufficient for the purposes of his ministry. But this was not all: for to stop the mouths of his opposers, and particularly of those who treated his character of Brachman as an imposture, he produced an old, dirty parchment, in which he had forged, in the ancient Indian characters, a deed, shewing that the Brachmans of *Rome* were of much older date than those of *India*, and that the Jesuits of *Rome* descended, in a direct line, from the God *Brama*. Nay, Father JOUVENCI, a learned Jesuit, tells us, in the History of his Order, something yet more remarkable; even that ROBERT DE NOBILI, when the authenticity of his smoky parchment was called in question by some Indian unbelievers, declared, upon oath, before the assembly of the Brachmans of *Madura*, that he (NOBILI) derived really and truly his origin from the God *Brama*. Is it not astonishing that this Reverend Father should acknowledge, is it not monstrous that he should applaud as a piece of pious ingenuity, this detestable instance of perjury and fraud? See JOUVENCI *Histoire des Jesuits*.—NORBERT *Memoires Historiques sur les Missions des Malab.* tom. ii. p. 145.]

[k] URBAN CERRI *État présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 173.

[l] The Indians distinguish all the Europeans by the general denomination of *Franks* or (as they pronounce the word) *Pranghis*.

[m] The Jesuits seem to want words to express the glory that has accrued to their Order from the remarkable success and the abundant fruits of this famous mission, as also the dreadful sufferings and hardships their missionaries have sustained in the course of their ministry. See the *Lettres Curieuses et Edifiantes écrites des Missions étrangères*, tom. i. p. 9. 32. 46. 50. 55. where Father MARTIN observes (p. 9.), that this mission surpasses all others; that each missionary baptizes, at least, a thousand converts every year (p. 11.); that, nevertheless, Baptism is not indiscriminately administered, or granted with facility and precipitation, to every one that demands it (p. 12.); that those who present themselves to be baptized, are accurately examined until they exhibit sufficient proofs of their sincerity, and are carefully instructed during the space of four months in order to their reception; that, after their reception, they live like angels, rather than like men; and that the smallest appearance of mortal sins is scarcely, if ever, to be found among them. If any one is curious enough to inquire into the causes that produce such an uncommon degree of sanctity among these new converts, the Jesuits alledge the two following; the first is modestly drawn from the holy lives and examples of the missionaries, who (p. 15.) pass their days in the greatest austerity, and in acts of mortification that are terrible to nature; (see tom. xii. p. 206. tom. xv. p. 211.) who are not allowed, for instance, the use of bread, wine, fish, or flesh, but are obliged to be satisfied with water and vegetables, dressed in the most insipid and disgusting manner, and whose cloathing, with the other circumstances of life, are answerable to their miserable diet. The second cause of this unusual appearance, alledged by the Jesuits, is the situation of these new Christians, by which they

CENT. XVII. be too ready to receive, as authentic and well attested, the relations that have been given of the intolerable hardships and sufferings that have been sustained by these *Jesuit-Brachmans* in the cause of CHRIST. Many imagine, and not without good foundation, that their austerities are, generally speaking, more dreadful in appearance than in reality; and that while they outwardly affect an extraordinary degree of self-denial, they indulge themselves, privately, in a free and even luxurious use of the creatures, have their tables delicately served, and their cellars exquisitely furnished, in order to refresh themselves after their labours.

In the kingdoms
of Siam, Ton-
quin &c.

VIII. The knowledge of Christianity was first conveyed to the kingdoms of *Siam*, *Tong-king*, and *Kochinchina*, by a mission of Jesuits under the direction of ALEXANDER of RHODES, a native of *Avignon* [n], whose instructions were received, with uncommon docility, by a prodigious number of the inhabitants of these countries. An account of the success of this spiritual expedition, being brought to ALEXANDER VII, in the year 1658, determined that pontif to commit this new church to the inspection and government of a certain number of bishops, and chose for this purpose some French priests, out of the *Congregation of foreign missions*, to carry his orders to the rising community, and to rule over it, as his representatives and vice-gerents. But the Jesuits, who can bear no superiors, and scarcely an equal, treated these pious men with the greatest indignity, loaded them with injuries and reproaches, and would not permit them to share their labours, nor to par-

are cut off from all communication and intercourse with the Europeans, who are said to have corrupted, by their licentious manners, almost all the other Indian proselytes to Christianity. Add to all this, other considerations, which are scattered up and down in the *Letters* above cited, tom. i. p. 16, 17. tom. ii. p. 1. tom. iii. p. 217. tom. v. p. 2. tom. vi. p. 119. tom. ix. p. 126.—*Madura* is a separate kingdom, situated in the midst of the Indian *Peninsula* beyond the *Ganges* *. There is an accurate map of the territory comprehended in the mission of *Madura*, published by the Jesuits in the xvth tome of the *Lettres Curieuses et Edifiantes*, p. 60. The French Jesuits set on foot, in the kingdom of *Carnate* and in the adjacent provinces, a mission like that of *Madura* (*Lettres Cur.* tom. v. p. 3. 240.) and, towards the conclusion of this century, other missionaries of the same Order formed an enterprise of the same nature in the dominions of the king of *Marava* (tom. ii. p. 1. tom. x. p. 79.) The Jesuits themselves however acknowledge (tom. vi. p. 3. 15. 66. 107.) that this latter establishment succeeded much better than that of *Carnate*. The reason of this may perhaps be, that the French Jesuits, who founded the mission of *Carnate*, could not endure with such constancy and patience the austere and mortified manner of living, which an institution of this nature required, nor imitate the rigid self-denial of the *Brachmans*, so well as the missionaries of *Spain* and *Portugal*.—Be that as it may, all these missions that formerly made such a noise in the world were suspended and abandoned, in consequence of a papal mandate issued out, in the year 1744, by BENEDICT XIV, who declared his disapprobation of the mean and perfidious methods of converting the Indians, that were practised by the Jesuits, and pronounced it unlawful to make use of frauds or insidious artifices in extending the limits of the Christian church. See NORBERT *Memoires Historiques pour les Missions Orientales*, tom. i. & iv. MAMMACHIUS has given an account of this matter, and also published the mandate of BENEDICT, in his *Orig. et Antiq. Christian.* tom. ii. p. 245.

[n] See the *Writings* of ALEXANDER DE RHODES, who was undoubtedly a man of sense and spirit, and more especially his *Travels*, which were published in 4^{to} at *Paris*, in the years 1666 and 1682.

[* This is a mistake. *Madura* is in the Indian *Peninsula* within *Ganges*, and not beyond it. Its principal produce is rice, which is one of the principal instruments made use of by the rich Jesuits in the conversion of the poor Indians.

take

take of their glory [o]. Hence arose, in the court of *Rome*, a long and tedious contest, which served to shew, in the plainest manner, that the Jesuits were ready enough to make use of the authority of the pope, when it was necessary to promote their interests or to extend their influence and dominion; but that they did not hesitate, on the other hand, to treat the same authority with indifference and contempt in all cases, where it appeared in opposition to their private views, and personal interests. After this, LEWIS XIV sent a solemn embassy [p], in the year 1684, to the king of *Siam*, whose prime minister, at that time, was a Greek Christian named CONSTANTINE FAULKON, a man of an artful, ambitious, and enterprising spirit. The design of this embassy was to engage the Pagan prince to embrace Christianity and to permit the propagation of the Gospel in his dominions. The ambassadors were attended by a great retinue of priests and Jesuits, some of whom were well acquainted with those branches of science, that were agreeable to the taste of the king of *Siam*. It was only, however, among a small part of the people, that the labours of these missionaries were crowned with any degree of success; for the monarch himself and the great men of his kingdom remained unmoved by their exhor-

[o] There were several Pamphlets and Memorials published at *Paris*, in the years 1666, 1674, and 1681, in which these French missionaries, whom the Jesuits refused to admit as fellow-labourers in the conversion of the Indians, relate, in an eloquent and affecting strain, the injuries they had received from that jealous and ambitious Order. The most ample and accurate narration of that kind was published at *Paris*, in the year 1688, by FRANCIS PALLU, whom the pope had created bishop of *Heliopolis*. The same matter is largely treated in the *Gallia Christiana* of the learned Benedictines, tom. vii. p. 1027. and a concise account of it is also given by URBAN CERRI, in his *État présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 199. This latter author, though a secretary of the Congregation de *propaganda fide*, yet inveighs with a just severity and a generous warmth against the perfidy, cruelty, and ambition of the Jesuits, and laments it as a most unhappy thing, that the Congregation, now mentioned, has not power enough to set limits to the rapacity and tyranny of that arrogant society. He further observes, towards the end of his *Narrative*, which is addressed to the pope, that he was not at liberty to reveal all the abominations, which the Jesuits had committed during the course of this contest, but, by the order of his Holiness, was obliged to pass them over in silence. His words are: *Votre sainteté a ordonné, qu'elles demeurassent sous le secret.*—See also on this subject, HELYOT *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques*, tom. viii. cap. xii. p. 84.

[p] The French bishops of *Heliopolis*, *Berytus*, and *Metellopolis*, that had been sent into *India* about the year 1663, had prepared the way for this embassy, and by an account of the favourable dispositions of the monarch, then reigning at *Siam*, had encouraged the French king to make a new attempt for the establishment of Christianity in these distant regions. A fixed residence had been formed at *Siam* for the French missionaries, together with a seminary for instructing the youth in the languages of the circumjacent nations, who had, all, settlements, or *camps*, as they are called, at the capital. A church was also erected there by the king's permission, in the year 1667, and that prince proposed several questions to the missionaries, which seemed to discover a propensity to inform himself concerning their religion. The bishop of *Heliopolis*, who had gone back to *Europe* on the affairs of the mission, returned to *Siam* in the year 1673, with letters from LEWIS XIV and Pope CLEMENT IX, accompanied with rich presents, to thank his Siamese majesty for the favours bestowed on the French bishops. In a private audience to which he was admitted, he explained, in answer to a question proposed to him by the king of *Siam*, the motive that had engaged the French bishops to cross so many seas, and the French king to send his subjects to countries so far from home, observing that a strong desire, in his prince, to extend the kingdom of the true God, was the sole reason of their voyage. Upon this we are told, that the king of *Siam* offered a port in any part of his dominions, where a city might be built to the honour of LEWIS THE GREAT, and where, if he thought fit, he might send a viceroy to reside, and declared afterwards in a public as-

CENT. XVII

tations, and deaf to their instructions [q]. The king, indeed, though he chose to persevere in the religion of his ancestors, yet discovered a spirit of condescension and toleration towards the conductors of this mission, and his favourite CONSTANTINE had secretly invited the French to *Siam* to support him in his authority, which was beheld with an envious eye by several of the *grande*s. So that as long as this prince and his minister lived the French still retained some hopes of accomplishing their purpose, and of converting the inhabitants of *Siam* to the faith. But these hopes entirely vanished in the year 1688, when, in a popular sedition, excited and fomented by some prince of the blood, both king and minister were put to death [r]; and then the missionaries returned home.

In China.

IX. *China*, the most extensive and opulent of all the Asiatic kingdoms, could not but appear to the missionaries and their constituents an object worthy of their pious zeal and ghostly ambition. And, accordingly a numerous tribe of *Jesuits*, *Dominicans*, *Franciscans*, and *Capuchins* set out, about the commencement of this century, with a view to enlighten that im-

sembly of the *grande*s of his court, that he would leave all his subjects at liberty to embrace the Romish faith. — All this raised the hopes of the missionaries to a very high pitch, but the expectations they derived from thence of converting the king himself were entirely groundless, as may be seen from a very remarkable declaration of that monarch in the following note. See the *Relations des Missions et des Voyages des Eveques François*, passim.]

[q] When Monsieur DE CHAUMONT, who was charged with this famous embassy, arrived at *Siam*, he presented a long memorial to the monarch of that country, intimating how solicitous the king of *France* was to have his *Siamese* majesty of the same religion with himself. CHAW NARAYA, (for so was the latter named) who seems to have always deceived the French by encouraging words, which administered hopes that he never intended to accomplish, answered this memorial in a very acute and artful manner. After asking who had made the king of *France* believe that he entertained any such sentiments, he desired his minister FAULKON to tell the French ambassador, "That he left it to his most Christian majesty to judge, whether the change of a religion, that had been followed in his dominions without interruption for 2229 years, could be a matter of small importance to him, or a demand with which it was easy to comply; — that, besides, he was much surprized to find the king of *France* concern himself so zealously and so warmly in a matter, which related to God and not to him, and in which, though it related to God, the Deity did not seem to meddle at all, but left it entirely to human discretion." The king asked at the same time, "Whether the true God, that created heaven and earth, and had bestowed on mankind such different natures and inclinations, could not, when he gave to men the same bodies and souls, have also, if he had pleased, inspired them with the same religious sentiments, and have made all nations live and die in the same laws?" He added, "that since order among men, and unity in religion, depend absolutely on divine providence, who could as easily introduce them into the world as that diversity of sects that prevails in it, it is natural to conclude from thence, that the true God takes as much pleasure to be honoured by different modes of religion and worship, as to be glorified by a prodigious number of different creatures, who praise him, every one in his own way." He moreover asked, "Whether that beauty and variety, which we admire in the order of nature, be less admirable in the order of supernatural things, or less becoming in the wisdom of God? — However that be, (continued the king of *Siam*) since we know that God is the absolute master of the world, and that we are persuaded nothing comes to pass contrary to his will, I resign my person and dominions into the arms of his providence, and beseech his eternal wisdom to dispose thereof according to his good will and pleasure." See TACHARD, *Prem. Voyage de Siam*, p. 218. as also the *Journal of the Abbé CHOISI*, who was employed in that embassy.]

[r] An account of this embassy, and of the transactions of both ambassadors and missionaries, is given by TACHARD, CHAUMONT, and LA LOUBERT. The relations, however, of the author last mentioned, who was a man of learning and candour, deserve undoubtedly the preference.

menfe

menſe region with the knowledge of the Goſpel. All theſe, however they differ in other matters, agree in proclaiming the aſtoniſhing ſucceſs of their miniſterial labours. It is nevertheleſs certain, that the principal honour of theſe religious exploits belongs to the Jeſuits, who, with a peculiar degree of dexterity and addreſs, removed the obſtacles that were the moſt adapted to retard the progreſs of Chriſtianity among a people, whoſe natural acuteness and pride were accompanied with a ſuperſtitious attachment to the religion and manners of their anceſtors. Theſe artful miſſionaries ſtudied the temper, character, taſte, inclinations, and prejudices of the Chineſe with incredible attention; and, perceiving that their natural ſagacity was attended with an ardent deſire of improvement in knowledge, and that they took the higheſt pleaſure in the ſtudy of the arts and ſciences, and more eſpecially in the mathematics, they loſt no occaſion of ſending for ſuch members of their Order, as, beſides their knowledge of mankind and prudence in tranſacting buſineſs, were alſo maſters of the different branches of learning and philoſophy. Some of theſe learned Jeſuits acquired, in a very ſhort ſpace of time, ſuch a high degree of credit and influence by their ſagacity and eloquence, the inſinuating ſweetneſs and facility of their manners, and their ſurprizing dexterity and ſkill in all kinds of tranſactions and affairs, that they came, at length, to the knowledge of the emperor, were loaded by him with the moſt honourable marks of diſtinction, and were employed in the moſt ſecret and important deliberations and affairs of the cabinet. Under the auſpicious protection of ſuch powerful patrons the other miſſionaries, though of a lower rank and of inferior talents, were delivered from all apprehenſion of danger in the exerciſe of their miniſtry, and thus encouraged to exert themſelves with ſpirit, vigour, and perfeverance in the propagation of the Goſpel, in all the provinces of that mighty empire.

X. This promiſing aſpect of things was clouded for ſome time, when XUN-CHI, the firſt Chineſe emperor of the Mogol race, died and left a ſon under age, as his only heir. The grandees of the empire, to whoſe tuition and care this young prince was committed, had long entertained an averſion to Chriſtianity, and only ſought for a convenient occaſion of venting their rage and malignity againſt it. This occaſion was now offered and greedily embraced. The guardians of the young prince abuſed his power to execute their vindictive purpoſes, and, after uſing their utmoſt efforts to extirpate Chriſtianity wherever it was profeſſed, they perſecuted its patrons, more eſpecially the Jeſuits, with great bitterneſs, deprived them of all the honours and advantages they had enjoyed, and treated them with the utmoſt barbarity and injuſtice. JOHN, ADAM SCHAAL, their chief, whoſe advanced age and extenſive knowledge, together with the honourable place he held at court, ſeemed to demand ſome marks of exemption from the calamities that purſued his brethren, was thrown into priſon, and condemned to death, while the other miſſionaries were ſent into exile. Theſe diſmal ſcenes of perſecution were exhibited in the year 1664; but about five years after this gloomy period, when KANG-HI aſſumed the reins of government, a new face of things appeared. The Chriſtian cauſe and the labours of its miniſters

The progreſs of
Chriſtianity in
China.

CENT. XVII.

sters not only resumed their former credit and vigour, but, in process of time, gained ground and received such distinguished marks of protection from the throne, that the Jesuits usually date from this period the commencement of the golden age of Christianity in *China*. The new emperor, whose noble and generous spirit [s] was equal to the uncommon extent of his genius and to his ardent curiosity in the investigation of truth, began his reign by recalling the Jesuits to his court, and restoring them to the credit and influence which they had formerly enjoyed. But his generosity and munificence did not stop here: for he sent to *Europe* for a still greater number of the members of that Order, such of them particularly as were eminent for their skill in the arts and sciences. Some of these he placed in the highest offices of the state, and employed in civil negotiations and transactions of the greatest importance. Others, he chose for his private friends and counsellors, who were to assist him with their advice in various matters, and to direct his philosophical and mathematical studies. These private friends and counsellors were principally chosen from among the French Jesuits. Thus the Order was raised, in a little time, to the very summit of favour, and cloathed with a degree of authority and lustre to which it had not hitherto attained. In such a state of things, it is but natural to conclude, that the Christian religion would not want powerful patrons, nor its preachers be left destitute and unsupported. And accordingly a multitude of spiritual labourers from all parts of *Europe* repaired to *China*, allured by the prospect of a rich, abundant, and glorious harvest. And, indeed, the success of their ministry seemed to answer fully the extent of their expectations; since it is well known, that, with very little pains, and still less opposition, they made a prodigious number of converts to the profession of the Gospel. The triumph of Christianity seemed to be complete, when, in the year 1692, the emperor, from an excessive attachment to the Jesuits, issued out that remarkable edict, by which he declared, that the Christian religion was, in no wise, detrimental to the safety or interests of the monarchy, as its enemies pretended, and by which also he granted to all his subjects an entire freedom of conscience and a full permission to embrace the Gospel. This triumph was still further confirmed, when the same prince, in the year 1700, ordered a magnificent church to be built for the Jesuits within the precincts of the imperial palace [t].

The Jesuits accused of fraudulent practices.

XI. This surprizing success of the Christian cause, was undoubtedly owing to the dexterity and perseverance of the Jesuits, as even the greatest enemies

[s] See JOACH. BOUVETI *Icon Regia Monarchæ Sinarum*, translated into Latin by the famous LEIBNITZ, and published, in the year 1699, in the second part of his *Novissima Sinica*. See also DU HALDE's *Description de la Chine*, and the *Lettres Edifiantes &c.* in which the Jesuits give an account of the success of their missions. In these productions the virtues and talents of this emperor, which seem, indeed, to be universally acknowledged, are described and celebrated with peculiar encomiums.

[t] There is a concise, but interesting account of these revolutions given by DU HALDE, in his *Description de la Chine*, tom. iii. p. 128. and by the Jesuit FONTANEY, in the *Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses*, tom. viii. p. 176.—They are related in a more diffuse and ample manner by other writers. See SUAREZ, *De libertate Religionem Christianam apud Sinas propagandi narratio*, published, in the year 1698, by LEIBNITZ, in the first part of his *Novissima Sinica*. The other au-

of that artful Order are obliged to acknowledge. But it is quite another question, whether this success was obtained by methods agreeable to the dictates of reason and conscience, and consistent with the dignity and genius of the Christian religion. This latter point has been long debated, with great animosity and vehemence, on both sides; and the contention is not yet ended. The adversaries of the Jesuits, whose opposition is as keen, as their numbers are formidable, and more especially the Jansenists and Dominicans, assert boldly, that the success above-mentioned was obtained by the most odious frauds, nay, even, in many cases, by the most detestable crimes. They charge the Jesuits with having given a false exposition, and a spurious account of the ancient religion of the Chinese, and with having endeavoured to persuade the emperor and the Chinese nobility, that the primitive theology of their nation, and the doctrine of their great instructor and philosopher CONFUCIUS, differed almost in nothing from the doctrine of the Gospel. They are further charged with having invented a variety of historical fictions in order to persuade the Chinese (who are vehemently attached to whatever carries the air of a remote antiquity) that JESUS CHRIST had been known and worshiped in their nation many ages ago; and these fictions are supposed to have prejudiced the emperor in favour of Christianity, and to have engaged certain grandees of the kingdom not only to grant their protection and favour to the Jesuits, but even to become members of their society. Nor do the accusations brought against the disciples of LOYOLA end here; for they are said to have entirely lost sight of all the duties and obligations, that are incumbent on the ministers of CHRIST, and the heralds of a spiritual kingdom, by not only accepting of worldly honours and places of civil authority and power, but even aspiring after them with all the ardor of an insatiable ambition, by boasting, with an arrogant vanity, of the protection and munificence of the emperor, by deserting the simplicity of a frugal and humble appearance and indulging themselves in all circumstances of external pomp and splendour, such as costly garments, numerous retinues, luxurious tables, and magnificent houses. To all which it is added, that they employed much more zeal and industry in the advancement of human science, especially the mathematics, than in promoting Christian knowledge and virtue; and that they even went so far as to meddle in military matters, and to concern themselves, both personally and by their counsels in the bloody scenes of war. While these heavy crimes are laid to the charge of those Jesuits, who by their capacity and talents had been raised to a high degree of credit in the empire, the more obscure members of that same Order, who were appointed more immediately to instruct the Chinese in the truths of the Gospel, are far from being considered as blameless. They are accused of spending in the practice of usury and in various kinds of traffic the precious moments which ought to have been consecrated to the functions of their ministry, and of using

thors, who have treated this branch of history, are mentioned by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toti orbi exorians*, cap. xxxix. p. 663. See also an *Ecclesiastical History of China*, which I published in German in the year 1748.

low

CENT. XVII. low and dishonourable methods of advancing their fortunes and insinuating themselves into the favour of the multitude. The Jesuits acknowledge, that a part of these accusations are founded upon facts; but they give a specious colour to those facts, and use all their artifice and eloquence to justify what they cannot deny. Other articles of these complaints they treat as groundless, and as the fictions of calumny, that are invented with no other design, than to cast a reproach upon their Order. An impartial inquirer into these matters will, perhaps, find, that if, in several points, the Jesuits defend themselves in a very weak and unsatisfactory manner, there are others in which their misconduct seems to have been exaggerated, by envy and prejudice, in the complaints of their adversaries.

An account of
the principal
charge brought
against the
Jesuits.

XII. The grand accusation, that is brought against the Jesuits in *China*, is this: that they make an impious mixture of light and darkness, of Chinese superstition and Christian truth, in order to triumph with the greater speed and facility over the prejudices of that people against the doctrine of the Gospel, and that they allow their converts to retain the profane customs and the absurd rites of their Pagan ancestors. RICCI, who was the founder of the Christian church in that famous monarchy, declared it as his opinion, that the greatest part of those rites, which the Chinese are obliged, by the laws of their country, to perform, might be innocently observed by the new converts. To render this opinion less shocking, he supported and explained it upon the following principle, that these rites were of a *civil*, and not of a *sacred* nature; that they were invented from views of policy, and not for any purposes of religion; and that none, but the very dregs of the populace in *China*, considered them in any other light [u]. This opinion was not only rejected by the Dominicans and Franciscans, who were associated with the Jesuits in this important mission, but also by some even of the most learned Jesuits both in *China* and in *Japan*, and particularly by NICHOLAS LOMBARD, who published a memorial, containing the reasons upon which his dissent was founded [w]. This contest, which was long carried on in a private manner, was brought, by the Dominicans, before the tribunal of the pontif in the year 1645, and from that period continued to produce great divisions, commotions, and caballing in the church of *Rome*. INNOCENT X, in the year now mentioned, pronounced in favour of the Dominicans, and highly condemned the indulgence, which the Jesuits had shewn to the Chinese superstitions. But, about eleven years after, this sentence, though not formally reversed, was nevertheless virtually annulled by ALEXANDER VII, at the instigation of the Jesuits, who persuaded that pontif to allow the Chinese converts the liberty of performing several of the rites to which they had been accustomed, and for which they discovered a peculiar fondness. This, however, did not hinder the Dominicans from

[u] See MAMMACHI *Origin. et Antiquit. Christian.* tom. ii. p. 373.

[w] See CHR. KORTHOLTI *Præfatio ad Volumen II, Epistolar. Leibnitii.* § vi. p. 18. who has likewise subjoined to this work the pieces composed against the Jesuits by LOMBARD and ANTHONY DE S. MARIA, with the remarks of LEIBNITZ. There is also inserted in this same collection (p. 413.) an ample dissertation on the Chinese philosophy, drawn up by LEIBNITZ, who pleads therein the cause of the Jesuits.

renewing their complaints in the years 1661, and again in 1674, under the pontificate of INNOCENT XI; though the power and credit of the Jesuits seemed to triumph over all their remonstrances. This fatal dispute, which had been suspended for several years in *China*, broke out there again, in the year 1684, with greater violence than ever, and then the victory seemed to incline to the side of the Dominicans in consequence of a decision pronounced, in the year 1693, by CHARLES MAIGROT, a doctor of the Sorbonne, who acted as the delegate or vicar of the Roman pontif in the province of *Fokien*, and who was, afterwards, consecrated titular bishop. This ecclesiastic, by a public edict, declared the opinions and practices of the Jesuits, in relation to the affairs of the Chinese mission, absolutely inconsistent with the purity and simplicity of the Christian religion. But the pope, to whose supreme cognizance and decision MAIGROT had submitted this important edict, refused to come to a determination on either side, before the matter, in debate, had been carefully examined, and the reasons of the contending parties weighed with the utmost attention; and, therefore, in the year 1699, he appointed a congregation of chosen doctors to examine and decide this tedious controversy. This resolution of the Roman pontif was no sooner made public, than all the enemies of the Jesuits, in all quarters of the church of *Rome*, and more especially those who wished ill to the Order in *France*, came forth with their complaints, their accusations, and invectives, and loaded the transactions and reputation of the whole society with the most bitter reproaches. The Jesuits, on the other hand, were neither silent, nor inactive. They attacked their adversaries with vigour, and defended themselves with dexterity and spirit [x]. — But the conclusion of this critical and momentous contest belongs to the history of the following century.

XIII. If in considering this controversy, which employed the ablest pens of the Romish church, we confine our attention to the merits of the cause, (passing over what personally concerns the Jesuits, with some other questions of a minute and incidental kind) it will appear, that the whole dispute turns essentially upon two great points; the one relating to the *Chinese notion* of the *supreme Being*; and the other to the *nature* of those honours, which that people offered to *certain persons deceased*.

As to the first of these points, it is to be observed, that the Chinese call the supreme object of their religious worship TIEN and SHANG-TI, which, in their language, signify the *Heavens*, and that the Jesuits employ the same terms when they speak of the true God, who is adored by the Christians. From hence it is inferred, that they make no sort of distinction between the supreme God of the Chinese, and the infinitely perfect Deity of the

The subject of the dispute between the Chinese Missionaries reducible to two great points:
First point.

[x] DU HALDE, *Description de la Chine*, tom. iii. p. 142.—See the enumeration of other writers, on the same subject, given by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toti orbi exorients*, cap. xxxix. p. 665.—See also VOLTAIRE, *Siecle de Louis XIV.* tom. ii. p. 318.—But the most ingenious patron of the Jesuits, on this occasion, was Father DANIEL, himself a member of that famous Order: see his *Histoire Apologetique de la Conduite des Jesuites de la Chine*, in the third volume of his *Opuscules*, p. 1.

CENT. XVII.

Christians, or (to express the same thing in other words) that they imagine the Chinese entertain the same notions concerning their TIEN or *Heaven*, that the Christians do concerning the God they adore. The question then relative to this first point is properly, as follows: "Do the Chinese understand by the denominations above-mentioned the *visible and material Heavens*; or are these terms, on the contrary, employed by them to represent the *Lord of these Heavens*, i. e. an eternal and all-perfect Being who presides over universal nature, and, from heaven, the immediate residence of his glory, governs all things with unerring wisdom?" or to express this question in fewer words, "Do the Chinese mean by their TIEN, such a Deity as the Christians adore?" this question the Jesuits answer in the affirmative. They maintain, that the ancient Chinese philosophers, who had an accurate knowledge of the great principles of natural religion, represented the supreme Being, almost, under the very same characters that are attributed to him by Christians; and hence they not only allow their Chinese disciples to employ the terms, already mentioned, in their prayers to the Deity and in their religious discourse, but even use these terms, themselves, when they pronounce the name of God in their public instructions, or in private conversation. The adversaries of the Jesuits maintain the negative of this question, regard the ancient philosophy of the Chinese as an impure source of blasphemy and impiety, and affirm, that it confounded the Divine Nature with that of the universe. They assert further, that the famous CONFUCIUS, whose name and writings are held in such veneration by the people of *China*, was totally ignorant of divine truth, destitute of religious principle, and traced the origin of all things that exist from an *internal and inevitable necessity*. This contest, concerning the first point that divided the Chinese missionaries, produced a multitude of learned dissertations on the manners, laws, and opinions of the ancient inhabitants of *China*, and gave rise to several curious discoveries. But all these were insufficient to serve the chief purpose they were designed to accomplish, since they were far from giving a satisfactory and clear decision of the matter in debate. It still remained a question, which were most to be believed? the Jesuits or their adversaries? and the impartial inquirer, after long examination, thought it prudent to trust intirely to neither; since if it appeared, on the one hand, that the TIEN or supreme God of the Chinese was much inferior, in perfection and excellence, to the God of the Christians, it was equally evident, on the other, that this Chinese Deity was looked upon by his worshipers, as entirely distinct from the material AETHER and the visible Heavens.

Second point.

XIV. As to the other great point in dispute, it must be previously observed, that the ancient laws of *China* oblige the natives of that vast region to perform, annually, at a stated time, in honour of their ancestors certain rites, which seem to be of a religious nature. It is to be observed further, that it is a custom among the learned to pay, likewise at stated times, to the memory of CONFUCIUS, whom the Chinese consider as the oracle of all wisdom and knowledge, certain marks of veneration, that have undoubtedly a religious aspect, and that are, moreover, performed in a kind of temples, erected

erected to that great and illustrious philosopher. Hence then ariseth a second question, which is thus proposed; "Are those honours, that the Chinese, in general, pay to the memory of their ancestors, and which the learned in particular, offer at the shrine of CONFUCIUS, of a civil or sacred nature? are they to be considered as religious offerings, or are they no more than political institutions designed to promote some public good?" The Jesuits affirm, that the ancient Chinese lawgivers established these rites with no other view than to keep the people in order, and to maintain the tranquillity of the state; and that the Chinese did not pay any religious worship either to the memory of CONFUCIUS, or to the departed souls of their ancestors, but only declared, by the performance of certain rites, their gratitude and respect to both, and their solemn resolution to imitate their virtues and follow their illustrious examples. From hence these missionaries conclude, that the Chinese converts to Christianity might be permitted to perform these ceremonies according to the ancient custom of their country, provided they understood their true nature, and kept always in remembrance the political views with which they were instituted, and the civil purposes they were designed to serve. By this specious account of things the conduct of the Jesuits is, in some measure, justified. But let this representation be true or false, it will still remain evident, that in order to render the Christian cause triumphant in China, some such concessions and accommodations as those of the Jesuits seem almost absolutely necessary; and they who desire the end, must submit to the use of the means [y]. The necessity of these concessions arises from this remarkable circumstance, that by a solemn law, of ancient date, it is positively declared, that no man should be esteemed a good citizen, or be looked upon as qualified to hold any public office in the state, who neglects the observance of the rites and ceremonies now under consideration. On the other hand, the Dominicans and the other adversaries of the Jesuits maintain, that the rites, in question, form an important branch of the Chinese religion; that the honours paid by the Chinese to CONFUCIUS, and to the souls of their ancestors, are not of a civil, but of a religious nature [z]; and consequently, that all who perform these rites are

[(y) True: if the means be not either criminal in themselves, pernicious in their consequences, or of such a nature as to defeat, in a great measure, the benefits and advantages proposed by the end. And it is a very nice and momentous question, whether the concessions pleaded for, in behalf of the Chinese converts, by the Jesuits, are not to be ranked among the means here characterised. See the following note.]

[(z) The public honours paid to CONFUCIUS twice a year, used to be performed before his statue, erected in the great hall or temple, that is dedicated to his memory. At present they are performed before a kind of Tablet, placed in the most conspicuous part of the edifice, with the following inscription: *The Throne of the Soul of the most Holy, and the most excellent Chief-teacher CONFUCIUS.* The *literati* or learned celebrate this famous festival in the following manner. The chief mandarin of the place exercises the office of priest, and the others discharge the functions of deacons, sub-deacons, and so on. A certain sacrifice, called *Ci*, which consists of wine, blood, fruits, &c. is offered, after the worshippers have prepared themselves for this ceremony by fasting and other acts of abstinence and mortification. They kneel before the inscription, prostrate the body nine times before it, until the head touches the ground, repeat a great variety of prayers; after which, the priest, taking, in one hand, a cup full of wine, and, in the other, a like cup filled with blood, makes a solemn libation to the deceased, and dismisses the assembly with a blessing. The

CENT. XVII. chargeable with insulting the majesty of God, to whom alone all divine worship is due, and cannot be looked upon as true Christians. This account of matters is so specious and so probable, and the consequences deducible from it are so natural and just, that the more equitable and impartial among the Jesuits have acknowledged the difficulties that attend the cause they maintain, and taking, at length, refuge in the plea of necessity, alledge, that certain evils and inconveniences may be lawfully submitted to, when they are requisite in order to the attainment of extensive, important, and salutary purposes.

The state of
Christianity in
Japan.

XV. The ministerial labours of the Romish missionaries, and, more especially, of the Jesuits, were crowned in *Japan*, with surprizing success towards the commencement of this century, and made an incredible number of converts to the Christian religion [a]. But this prosperous and flourishing state of Christianity in *Japan*, was not without its peculiar circumstances. Rites performed by families, in honour of their deceased parents, are pretty much of the same nature.

Now in order to know, with certainty, whether this festival and these rites be of a *civil* or *religious* nature, we have only to inquire, whether they be the same with those ceremonies that are performed, by the Chinese, in the worship they pay to certain celestial and terrestrial *spirits* or *genii*, which worship is undoubtedly of a religious kind. The learned LEIBNITZ * undertook to affirm, that the services, now mentioned, were not of the same kind, and, consequently, that the Jesuits were accused unjustly. But that great man does not appear to have examined this matter with his usual sagacity and attention. For it is evident, from a multitude of relations every way worthy of credit, and, particularly, from the observations made on the Chinese missions by that learned and candid Franciscan, ANTONIO DE S. MARIA †, not only that CONFUCIUS was worshiped among the *idols* and the *celestial and terrestrial spirits* of the Chinese, but that the oblations and ceremonies, observed in honour of him, were perfectly the same with those that were performed as acts of worship to these *idols* and *spirits*. Those that desire a more ample account of this matter, may consult the following authors: BUDÆI *Annal. Histor. Philos.* p. 287. where he treats *De Superstitioso Demortuorum apud Sinenses cultu*.—WOLFII *Not. ad Casaubon.* p. 342.—NIC. CHARMOS, *Annot. ad Maigrotti Historiam cultus Sinensis*.—But more especially ARNAUD, *Morale Pratique des Jesuites*, tom. iii. vi. vii. and a collection of historical relations published at *Cologne* in 8^{vo}. in the year 1700, under the following title: *Historia cultus Sinensium, seu Varia Scripta de cultibus Sinarum inter Vicarios Apostolicos, & P. P. S. J. controversis*.]

[(a) Two peculiar circumstances contributed to facilitate the progress of the Romish religion in *Japan*. The first was the uncharitable severity and cruelty of the Japanese priests or *bonzas* towards the sick and indigent, compared with the humanity, zeal, and beneficence of the missionaries. These *bonzas* represented the poor and infirm, not as objects of pity, but as wretches loaded with the displeasure of the Gods, and abandoned to present and future misery by the judgments of heaven, and inspired the rich with a contempt and abhorrence of them. The Christian religion, therefore, which declares that poverty and afflictions are, often, surer marks of the divine favour than grandeur and prosperity, and that the transitory evils, which the righteous endure here, shall be crowned with everlasting glory and felicity hereafter, was every way proper to comfort this unhappy class of persons, and could not but meet with a most favorable reception among them. Add to this, that the missionaries were constantly employed in providing them with food, physic, and habitations. A second circumstance that was advantageous to Christianity (that is, to such a form of Christianity as the popish missionaries preached in *Japan*) was a certain resemblance or analogy between it and some practices and sentiments that prevailed among the Japanese. These Indians look for present and future felicity only through the merits of *Xaca Amida*, and other of their Deities, who, after a long course of severe mortifications, freely undertaken, had voluntarily, also, put an end to their lives. They fainted many melancholy persons, who had been guilty of suicide, celebrated their memories, and implored their intercession and good offices. They used processions, statues, candles, and perfumes in their worship, as also prayers for the dead and auricular confession, and had monasteries founded for certain devout persons of both sexes, who lived in celibacy,

* See *Præf. Novissim. Sinicorum*.

† See vol. ii. *Epp. Leibnitz*.

ing state of the church was somewhat interrupted by the prejudices, that the priests and grandees of the kingdom had conceived against the new religion, prejudices, which proved fatal, in many places, both to those who embraced it, and to those who taught it. The cause of Christianity did not, however, suffer only from the virulence and malignity of its enemies; it was wounded in the house of its friends, and received, no doubt, some detriment from the intestine quarrels and contentions of those, to whom the care of the rising church was committed. For the same scenes of fraternal discord, that had given such offence in the other Indian provinces, were renewed in *Japan*, where the *Dominicans*, *Franciscans*, and *Augustinians* were at perpetual variance with the *Jesuits*. This variance produced, on both sides, the heaviest accusations, and the most bitter reproaches. The *Jesuits* were charged, by the missionaries of the three Orders now mentioned, with insatiable avarice, with shewing an excessive indulgence both to the vices and superstitions of the *Japanese*, with crafty and low practices unworthy of the ministers of *CHRIST*, with an ambitious thirst after authority and dominion, and other misdemeanours of a like nature. These accusations were not only exhibited at the court of *Rome*, but were spread abroad in every part of *Christendom*. The disciples of *LOYOLA* were, by no means, silent under these reproaches; but, in their turn, charged their accusers with imprudence, ignorance of the world, obstinacy, asperity of manners, and a disgusting rusticity in their way of living, adding, that these circumstances rendered their ministry rather detrimental, than advantageous to the cause of Christianity among a people remarkable for their penetration, generosity, and magnificence. Such then were the contests that arose among the missionaries in *Japan*; and nothing, but the amazing progress that Christianity had already made, and the immense multitude of those that had embraced it, could have prevented these contests from being fatal to its interests. As the case stood, neither the cause of the Gospel, nor its numerous professors received any essential damage from these divisions; and if no other circumstance had intervened to stop its progress, an expedient might have probably been found out, either to heal these divisions, or, at least, to appease them so far as to prevent their noxious and fatal consequences [b].

XVI. But a new and dreadful scene of opposition arose, in the year 1615, to blast the hopes of those who wished well to the cause of Christianity in *Japan*. For, in that year, the emperor issued out against the professors and ministers of that divine religion, a persecuting edict, which was executed with a degree of barbarity, unparalleled in the annals of the Christian history. This cruel persecution raged, during the space of many years, with

Its downfall and
extirpation there.

solitude, and abstinence. So that the *Japanese* religion was no bad preparation for popery. Besides these two circumstances, another may be mentioned, which we take from the Letters of the *Jesuits* themselves, who inform us, that the Maritime princes of *Japan* were so fond of this new commerce with the *Portuguese*, that they strove who should oblige them most, and encouraged the missionaries, less perhaps from a principle of zeal, than from views of interest. See *VARENIUS, Descript. Japon. lib. iii. cap. vi. x. Modern Univ. History, vol. ix. p. 24. edit. 8^o.*

[b] See the writers on this subject enumerated by *FABRICIUS*, in his *Lux Evangelii toti orbi exorients*, p. 678. as also *CHARLEVOIX, Histoire du Japon, tom. ii. livr. xi. p. 57.*

unrelenting

CENT. XVII.

unrelenting fury, and only ended with the total extinction of Christianity throughout that mighty empire. That religion, which had been suffered to make such a rapid and triumphant progress in *Japan*, was, at length, considered, as detrimental to the interests of the monarchy, inconsistent with the good of the people, derogatory from the majesty of their high priest, whom they revered as a person descended from the Gods; and, on these accounts, was judged unworthy not only of protection, but even of toleration. This judgment was followed with the fatal Order, by which all foreigners, that were Christians, and, more especially, the Spanish and Portuguese were commanded to depart the kingdom, and the natives, who had embraced the Gospel, to renounce the name and doctrine of CHRIST, on pain of death, presented to them in the most dreadful forms. This tremendous Order was the signal for the perpetration of such horrors, as the most sanguine and atrocious imagination will scarcely be able to conceive. Innumerable multitudes of the Japanese Christians of each sex, and of all ages, ranks, and stations expired, with magnanimous constancy, amidst the most dreadful torments, rather than apostatize from the faith they had embraced. And here it may not be amiss to observe, that both the Jesuits and their adversaries in the missions, expiated, in some measure, if I may so express myself, by the agonies they endured and the fortitude with which they suffered, the faults they had committed in the exercise of their ministry. For it is well known, that the greatest part of them died magnanimously for the cause of CHRIST, by the hands of the executioner, and that some of them even expired with triumphant feelings of satisfaction and joy.

Historians are not entirely agreed with respect to the real causes of this merciless persecution. The Jesuits consider it, as owing, in part, to the imprudence of the Dominicans and Franciscans; while these latter impute it, in a great measure, to the covetous, arrogant, and factious spirit of the Jesuits [c]. Both parties accuse the English and Dutch of having excited, in the emperor of *Japan*, a strong prejudice against the Spaniards, Portuguese, and the Roman pontif, to the end that they, alone, might engross the commerce of that vast monarchy, and be unrivalled in their credit among that powerful people. The English and Dutch alledge, on the other hand, that they never attempted to undermine, by any false accusations, the credit of the Roman-Catholics, in that kingdom, but only detected the perfidious plots the Spaniards had laid against it. Almost all the Historians,

[c] There is a concise and sensible account of this tedious dispute in the sixth *Discourse* that is subjoined to the English edition of KAEMPFER's *History of Japan*, § iv. p. 64—75. But it will also be proper to see what is said, on the other side, by an author, who, in his long and circumstantial narration, has not omitted any incident, however minute, that tends, in the least, to disculpate the Jesuits, or to procure them indulgence; that author is CHARLEVOIX; see his *Histoire Generale de Japon*, tom. ii. livr. xii. p. 136. The other historians that may be consulted, with utility, on this subject, are enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toti orbi exorients*, cap. x. p. 678. Add to these the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. Mens. Februar. p. 723. where there is not only a history of the commencement and progress of Christianity in *Japan*, but also an account of the lives and martyrdom of those, who first suffered for the cause of the Gospel in that kingdom. See likewise MAMMACHI *Origines et Antiquitat. Christian.* tom. ii. p. 376.

who have given accounts of this country, unanimously inform us, that certain letters, intercepted by the Dutch, and other circumstances of a very striking and alarming kind, had persuaded the emperor that the Jesuits, as also the other missionaries, had formed seditious designs against his government, and that they aimed at nothing less than exciting their numerous disciples to rebellion, with a view to reduce the kingdom of *Japan* under the dominion of *Spain* [d]. A discovery of this nature could not but make the most dreadful impressions upon a prince naturally suspicious and cruel, such as the emperor, then reigning, was; and indeed so it happened; for the moment he received this information, he concluded with equal precipitation and violence, that he could not sit secure on his throne, while the smallest spark of Christianity remained unextinguished in his dominions, or any of its professors breathed under his government. It is from this remarkable period, that we must date the severe edict by which all Europeans are forbidden to approach the Japanese dominions, and in consequence of which all the terrors of fire and sword are employed to destroy whatever carries the remotest aspect, or shadow of the Christian doctrine. The only exception to this universal law is made in favour of an handful of Dutch merchants, who are allowed to import, annually, a certain quantity of European commodities, and have a factory, or rather a kind of prison, allowed them in one of the extremities of the kingdom, where they are strictly watched and rigorously confined from all communication with the natives, but what is essentially necessary to the commerce they are permitted to carry on.

XVII. The example of the Roman-Catholic states could not but excite a spirit of pious emulation in protestant countries, and induce them to propagate a still purer form of Christianity among those unhappy nations that lay groveling in the darkness of paganism and idolatry. Accordingly, the Lutherans were, on several occasions, solicited by persons of eminent merit and rank in their communion, to embark in this pious and generous undertaking. JUSTINIAN ERNEST baron of WELS, distinguished himself by the zealous appearance he made in this good cause, having formed the plan of a society, that was to be intrusted with the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts, and that was to bear the name of JESUS, the divine founder of the religion they were to promote [e]. But several circumstances concurred to prevent the execution of this pious design, among which we may reckon, principally, the peculiar situation of the Lutheran princes, of whom very few have either territories, forts, or settlements beyond the limits of *Europe*.

This was, by no means, the case with the princes and states that professed the Reformed religion. The English and Dutch, more especially, whose ships covered the ocean and sailed to the most distant corners of the globe,

Protestant missions in *Asia*.

[d] The discoveries made by the Dutch were against the Portuguese, with whom they were then at war; so that instead of *Spain*, our author should have said *Portugal*. See KAEMPFER *loc. cit.* as also the *Universal Modern History*, vol. ix. p. 145. note (z) edit. 8^{vo}.]

[e] See MOLLER *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. iii. p. 75. as also a German work of the learned ARNOLD, entitled, *Kirchen und Ketzer Historie*, part. II. book xvii. c. xv. § 23. p. 1066. part. III. cap. xv. § 18. p. 150.

and

CENT. XVII. and who, moreover, in this century, had sent colonies to *Asia*, *Africa*, and *America*, had abundant opportunities of spreading abroad the knowledge of Christianity among the unenlightened nations. Nor were these opportunities entirely neglected, or misimproved, notwithstanding the reports, that have generally prevailed, of their being much more zealous in engrossing the riches of the Indians than in bringing about their conversion; though it may, perhaps, be granted, that neither of these nations exerted themselves, to the extent of their power, in this salutary undertaking. In the year 1647, the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts was committed by an act of the English parliament to the care and inspection of a society composed of persons of eminent rank and merit. The civil wars that ensued suspended the execution of the plans that were laid for carrying on this salutary work. In the year 1661, under the reign of CHARLES II, the work was resumed, and the society re-established. In the year 1701, this respectable society received singular marks of protection and favour from King WILLIAM III, who enriched it with new donations and privileges [f]. Since that period even to the present time it has been distinguished by ample marks of the munificence of the kings of *England*, and of the liberality of persons of all ranks and orders, and has been, and continues to be eminently useful in facilitating the means of instruction to the nations that lie in Pagan darkness, and, more especially, to the Americans. Nor are the laudable efforts of the United Provinces, in the advancement and propagation of Christian knowledge, to be passed over in silence; since they, also, are said to have converted to the Gospel a prodigious number of Indians in the islands of *Ceylon* and *Formosa*, the coasts of *Malabar*, and other Asiatic settlements, which they either had acquired by their own industry, or obtained, by conquest, from the Portuguese [g]. Some historians, perhaps, may have exaggerated, in their relations, the numbers of profelytes made by the Dutch; it is, nevertheless, most certain, that as soon as that nation had got a sufficient footing in the *East Indies*, they laid with wisdom, and executed, at a great expence, various schemes for instructing the natives of those distant regions in the doctrines of the Gospel [h].

The African
missions.

XVIII. The inward parts of *Africa* remain still in the darkness of Paganism, as they have been hitherto inaccessible to the most adventurous of the Europeans. But in the maritime provinces of that great *Peninsula*, and more especially in those, where the Portuguese have their settlements, there are several districts in which the religion of *Rome* has prevailed over the savage superstitions of that barbarous region. It is, nevertheless, acknowledged by the more ingenuous historians, even among the Roman-Catholics,

[f] See KENNET's *Account of the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts*.

[g] See *Epist. de Successu Evangelii apud Indos Orientales ad Johan. Leusdenium scriptas et Ultrajeæ*. 1699, in 8^{vo} editas.

[h] See BRAUN's *Veritable Religion des Hollandois*, p. 71. 267, &c. This *Treatise*, which was published at *Amsterdam* in the year 1675, was designed as an answer to a malignant libel, of one STROUP, entitled, *La Religion des Hollandois*, in which that writer proposed to persuade the world that the Dutch had almost no religion at all.

who have given accounts of the African colonies, that of the proselytes made there to the Gospel, a very small number deserve the denomination of Christians; since the greatest part of them retain the abominable superstitions of their ancestors, and the very best among them dishonour their profession by various practices of a most vicious and corrupt nature. Be that as it may, whatever progress Christianity made in these parts must be chiefly attributed to the zealous labours of the Capuchin missionaries, who, in this century, suffered the most dreadful hardships and discouragements in their attempts to bring the fierce and savage Africans under the Christian yoke. These attempts succeeded so far as to gain over to the profession of the Gospel the kings of *Benin* and *Awerri* [i], and also to engage the cruel and intrepid ANNA ZINGHA, queen of *Metamba*, and all her subjects, to embrace, in the year 1652, the Christian faith [k]. The African missions were allotted to this austere Order by the court of *Rome*, and by the society *de propaganda fide*, for wise reasons; since none were so proper to undertake an enterprize attended with such dreadful hardships, difficulties, and perils, as a sett of men, whose monastic institute had rendered familiar to them the severest acts of mortification, abstinence, and penance, and thus prepared them for the bitterest scenes of trial and adversity. The *Capuchins* also seem to have been, alone, honoured with this sacred, but arduous commission; nor does it appear, that the other Orders beheld, with the smallest sentiment of envy, their dear-bought glory.

XIX. The extensive continent of *America* swarms with colonies from *Spain*, *Portugal*, and *France* [l], all which profess the Christian religion, as it has been disfigured by the church of *Rome*. But it is abundantly known, that these colonists, more especially the Spaniards and Portuguese, are the most worthless and profligate sett of men that bear the Christian name; and this fact is confirmed by the testimonies of several Roman-catholic writers of great merit and authority, who cannot be suspected of partiality in this matter. Nay the clergy, themselves, are not excepted in this general condemnation, but, as we learn from the same credible testimonies, surpass even the idolatrous natives in the ridiculous rites, which they perform in the

The American missions.

[i] Called by some *Ouverne*.

[k] For a more ample account of this Queen and her conversion Dr. MOSHEIM refers the reader (in his note [r]) to URBAN CERRI'S *État Present de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 222. and to the third and fourth volumes of FATHER LABAT'S *Relation Historique de l'Afrique Occidentale*, in the former of which he tells us, there is a French translation of ANT. GAVAZZI'S account of *Africa*. All these citations are inaccurate. CERRI makes no mention of ZINGHA nor of METAMBA; nor does LABAT, in any of the five volumes of his *Historical Relation*, here quoted; nor is GAVAZZI'S account translated in that work.—In general it may be observed, that the missions in *Africa* were greatly neglected by the Portuguese, and that the few missionaries, sent thither, were men absolutely void of learning and destitute almost of every qualification that was necessary to the carrying on such an important undertaking. See LABAT'S Preface to his *Relation Historique de l'Afrique Occidentale*; as also the *Modern Universal History*, vol. xiv. p. 10, 11. edit. 8^{vo}.]

[l] See the authors mentioned by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii orbem Terrarum collustrans*, cap. xlviii, xlix. p. 769.—There is a cursory account of the state of the Romish religion, in that part of *America* which is possessed by the European Roman-catholics, in URBAN CERRI'S *État present de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 245.

CENT. XVII. worship of God, as well as in the licentiousness of their manners, and the enormity of the crimes they commit without reluctance. Those of the ancient inhabitants of *America*, who, either have submitted to the European yoke, or live near their colonies, have imbibed some faint knowledge of the Romish religion from the Jesuits, Franciscans, and other ecclesiastics; but these feeble rays of instruction are totally clouded by the gloomy suggestions of their native superstition, and the corrupt influence of their barbarous customs and manners. As to those Indians, who live more remote from the European settlements, and wander about in the woods without any fixed habitation, they are absolutely incapable either of receiving or retaining any adequate notions of the Christian doctrine, unless they be previously reclaimed from that vagrant manner of life, and civilized by an intercourse with persons, whose humane and insinuating manners are adapted to attract their love and excite their imitation. This the Jesuits and other ecclesiastics of different Orders in the church of *Rome*, who have been sent in later times to convert these wandering savages, have found by a constant and uniform experience [m]. Hence the former have erected cities, and founded civil societies, cemented by government and laws, like the European states, in several Indian provinces both in *South* and *North-America*; and it is on this account that they discharge the double functions of magistrates and doctors among these their new subjects and disciples, whose morals and sentiments, it is said, they endeavour to preserve pure and uncorrupted by permitting few or no Europeans to approach them [n]. These arduous and difficult attempts have furnished to the disciples of LOYOLA ample matter of boasting, and a lucky occasion of extolling the zeal, the dexterity and industry of their Order. But it has appeared from relations, worthy of credit, that these exploits of the Jesuits, in the internal and more inaccessible provinces of *America*, are not so much carried on with a view to the propagation of Christianity, as with an intention to gratify their own insatiable avarice and boundless ambition. And, accordingly, they are reported to send yearly to the members of their Order, in *Europe*, immense quantities of gold drawn from several American provinces, where they have power and property, but chiefly from *Paraguay*, which belongs to them alone [o].

[m] A great variety of facts are alledged as a proof of this in the *Letters*, in which the French Jesuits give their friends, in *Europe*, an account of the success and fruits of their mission, and which are regularly published at *Paris*.

[(n) That this was, by no means, the only, nor even the principal, reason of cutting off all communication between the Indians and Europeans, will appear evident from the contents of the following note.]

[o] While Father LABAT was at *Rome*, Father TAMBURINI, at that time general of the Jesuits, asked him several questions, relating to the progress of Christianity in *America*; to which with equal courage and candour he gave immediately this general answer, "that the Gospel had made little or no real progress in that country; that he had never met with one adult person among the Americans, who could be esteemed a true proselyte to Christianity; and that the missionaries could scarcely pretend to any other exploits (*of a spiritual kind*) than their having baptized some children at the point of death*." He added, at the same time, "that in order to make the

* See LABAT *Voyage en Espagne et en Italie*, tom. viii. p. 7.

XX. The cause of Christianity was promoted with more wisdom, and consequently with better success, in those parts of *America* where the English formed settlements during this century; and though it had the greatest ignorance, stupidity, and indolence to conquer, made, in a little time, a considerable progress. The English *Independants*, who retired to *America* on account of their dissension from the established religion of their country, claimed the honour of carrying thither the first rays of divine truth, and of beginning a work that has been since continued with such pious zeal and such abundant fruit; and indeed this claim is founded in justice. Several families of this sect, that had been settled in *Holland*, removed from thence

Protestant missions in *America*.

"Americans *Christians*, it was previously necessary to make them *men*." This bold Dominican, who had been, himself, a missionary in the American islands, had a great mind to give *TAMBU-RINI* some seasonable advice concerning the immense wealth and authority, that the Jesuits had acquired in these parts of the world; but the cunning old man eluded artfully this part of the conversation, and turned it upon another subject. *LABAT* gave, upon another occasion, a still greater proof of his undaunted spirit and presence of mind; for when, in an audience granted him by *CLEMENT XI*, that pontif praised, in pompous terms, the industry and zeal of the Portuguese and Spanish missionaries in promoting the salvation of the Americans, and reproached the French with inactivity and indifference in a matter of such high importance, our resolute Dominican told him plainly, "that the Spaniards and Portuguese boasted of the success of their labours without any sort of foundation; since it was well known, that, instead of *converts*, they had only made *hypocrites*, all their disciples among the Indians having been forced, by the dread of punishment and the terrors of death, to embrace Christianity;" adding moreover, "that such as had received baptism continued as open and egregious idolaters as they had been before their profession of Christianity*." To this account we might add the relations of a whole cloud of witnesses, whose testimonies are, every way, worthy of credit, and who declare, unanimously, the same thing. See, among others, a remarkable piece, entitled, *Memoire touchant l'Etablissement considerable des Peres Jesuites dans les Indes d'Espagne*, which is subjoined to *FREZIER's Relation du Voyage de la Mer du Sud*, p. 577. See also *Voyage aux Indes Occidentales*, par *FRANC. COREAL*, tom. ii. p. 67. 43. and *MAMMACHIUS, Orig. et Antiquit. Christian.* tom. ii. p. 337. There is a particular account of the Jesuits of *Paraguay* given by *DON ULLOA*, in his *Voyage d'Amerique*, tom. i. p. 540. but this account is partial in their favour. They are also zealously and artfully defended, in an account of the mission of *Paraguay*, published by *MURATORI* in the year 1743.—[When *Dr. MOSHEIM* wrote this note, the important discovery, that placed the ambitious, despotic, and rebellious proceedings of the Jesuits in *Paraguay* in the plainest and most striking light, had not been yet made. The book of *MURATORI*, which was published at *Venice* in the year 1743, and re-published, in a French translation, at *Paris* in 1754, deceived, for some time, the over-credulous, nay, induced even the enemies of the Jesuits to suspect that their conduct at *Paraguay* was not so criminal as it had been represented. So that, notwithstanding the accusations that had been brought against these missionaries by the writers mentioned by *Dr. MOSHEIM*: notwithstanding a memorial sent to the court of *Spain*, in the year 1730, by *DON MARTIN DE BARUA*, at that time Spanish governor of *Paraguay*, in which the Jesuits are charged with the most ambitious projects and the most rebellious designs, and represented as setting up an independent government, of carrying on a prodigious trade, and other things of that nature: and notwithstanding the circumstantial evidence of various known facts that supported these accusations in the strongest manner: notwithstanding all this, the public was more or less deceived. The illusion, however, did not last long. In the year 1750, the courts of *Madrid* and *Lisbon* entered into a treaty for fixing the limits of their respective dominions in *South-America*. The Jesuits, who had formed an independent Republic in the heart of these dominions, composed of the Indians, whom they had gained by the insinuating softness and affected mildness, humility and generosity of their proceedings, were much alarmed at this treaty. It was one of the fundamental laws of this new state (which was founded under the mask of a Christian mission) that neither

* See *LABAT Voyage en Espagne et en Italie*, tom. viii. p. 12.

CENT. XVII. into *America* [p] in the year 1620, in order, as they alledged, to transmit their doctrine pure and undefiled to future ages; and there they laid the foundations of a new state [q]. The success, that attended this first emigration, engaged great numbers of the people, called *Puritans*, who groaned under the oppression of the bishops, and the severity of a court, by which this oppression was authorized, to follow the fortunes of these religious adventurers [r]; and this produced a second emigration in the year 1629. But notwithstanding the success that, in process of time, crowned this enterprise, its first beginnings were unpromising, and the colonists, immediately after their arrival, laboured under such hardships and difficulties in the dreary and uncultivated wilds of this new region, that they could make but little progress in instructing the Indians: their whole zeal and industry being scarcely sufficient to preserve the infant settlement from the horrors of famine. But towards the year 1633 [s], things put on a better aspect: the colony began to flourish, and the new comers, among whom the Puritans MAYHEW, SHEPPARD, and ELLIOT made an eminent figure, had the leisure, courage, and tranquillity of mind that were necessary to the execution of such an important and arduous design. All these devout exiles were remarkably zealous, laborious, and successful in the conversion of the Indians;

bishop, governor, nor any officer civil, military, or ecclesiastical, nay, nor even any individual Spaniard or Portuguese should be admitted into its territories, to the end that the proceedings and projects of the Jesuits might still remain an impenetrable secret. The members of their Order were alone to be instructed in this profound and important mystery. The use of the Spanish language was prohibited throughout the extent of this new territory in order to prevent more effectually all communication between the Indians and that nation. The Indians were trained to the use of arms, furnished with artillery, instructed in the art of war, taught to behold the Jesuits as their sovereigns and their Gods, and to look upon all white people, except the Jesuits, as demons, atheists, and, moreover, as their barbarous and mortal enemies. Such was the state of things, when, in the year 1752, the united troops of *Spain* and *Portugal* marched towards the eastern borders of the river *Uragai* to make the exchanges of certain villages that had been agreed upon in the treaty abovementioned. Upon this the Jesuits, not being sufficiently prepared for their defence, demanded a delay of the execution of the treaty under various pretexts. This delay was granted. But as the Spanish general *Gomez Freire Andrada* perceived that these *Holy Fathers* employed this delay in arming the Indians and confirming them in their rebellion, he wrote to his court and received new orders from thence to proceed to the execution of the treaty. A war ensued between the Spanish and Portuguese on one side, and the Indians, animated by the Jesuits, on the other, in which the Spanish general lost his life, and of which the other circumstances are well known. This was the real and original cause of the disgrace of the Jesuits at the court of *Portugal*. Those who desire a more particular account of this matter will find it in a famous pamphlet, drawn from an authentic memorial, published by the court of *Lisbon*, and printed at the *Hague*, in the year 1758, under the following title: *La Republique des Jesuites au Paraguay renversée, ou Relation Authentique de la Guerre que ces Religieux ont osé soutenir contre les Monarques d'Espagne et de Portugal en Amerique, pour y defendre les domaines dont ils avoient usurpé la Souveraineté au Paraguay, sous pretexte de Religion.*

[p] This colony settled in that part of *America*, that was afterwards called *New Plymouth*.

[q] See NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 128.—As also a German work, entitled, ANT. WILH. BOHM *Englische Reformation's Historie*, b. vi. c. v. p. 807.

[r] See MATHER'S *History of New England*, p. 126.—NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 208.

[s] Dr. MOSHEIM says in the year 1623, but this is, probably, an error of the press; since it is well known, that the emigration of *Sheppard* and *Elliot* happened between 1631 and 1634.]

but

but none acquired such a shining reputation, in this pious career, as JOHN CENT. XVII. ELLIOT, who learned their language, into which he translated the Bible and other instructive and edifying books, gathered together the wandering savages, and formed them into regular congregations, instructed them in a manner suited to the dullness of their comprehension, and the measure of their respective capacities; and, by such eminent displays of his zeal, dexterity, and indefatigable industry, merited, after his death, the honourable title of the *Apostle of the Indians* [t].

The unexpected success, that attended these pious attempts towards the propagation of Christian knowledge, drew the attention of the parliament and people of *England*; and the further advancement of this good cause appeared an object of sufficient importance to employ the deliberations, and to claim the protection of the great council of the nation. Thus was formed that illustrious society, which derives its title from the great purpose of its institution, even the *Propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts*, and which in proportion to the increase of its number, influence, revenues, and prerogatives, has still renewed and augmented its efforts for the instruction of the Pagans in all parts of the world, particularly those on the American continent. It is true, that, after all its efforts, much is yet to be done; but it is also true, and must be acknowledged by all that have examined these matters with attention and impartiality, that much has been done, and that the pious undertakings of this respectable society have been followed with unexpected fruit. With respect to the province of *Pensilvania*, which receives in its bosom, without distinction, persons of all sects and all opinions, we shall have occasion to speak of its religious state in another place. The American provinces, that were taken from the Portuguese by the Dutch under the command of Count MAURICE of *Nassau*, became immediately an object of the pious zeal of their new masters, who began, with great ardor and remarkable success, to spread the light of the Gospel among the wretched inhabitants of those benighted regions [u]. But this fair prospect was afterwards clouded, in the year 1644, when the Portuguese recovered the territories they had lost. As to the Dutch colony, that is settled at *Surinam*, we cannot say much; having never received the smallest information of any attempts made by them to instruct the neighbouring Indians in the knowledge of Christianity [w].

XXI. Religion, in general, and the Christian religion, in particular, had many enemies to encounter in this century; though their number has been studiously diminished in the accounts of some, and greatly exaggerated in the representations of others. The English complain of the reign of

The enemies of
Christianity in
England.

[t] HORNBECKIUS, *De Conversione Indorum et Gentil.* lib. ii. cap. xv. p. 260.—CRESCENTII MATHERI *Epistola de Successu Evangelii apud Indos Occidentales ad Joh. Leusdenium, Traject.* 1699, in 8vo.

[u] JO. HENR. HOTTINGERI *Topographia Ecclesiastica*, p. 47.—JANIÇON, *Etat Present des Provinces Unies*, tom. i. p. 396.—The same author gives an account of *Surinam*, and of the state of religion in that colony, chap. xiv. p. 407.

[w] There are three churches in that settlement for the use of the colonists; but no attempt has been made to spread the knowledge of the Gospel among the natives.

CENT. XVII. CHARLES II, as the fatal period, when corruption of manners, and vice, in the most licentious and profligate forms, over-ran their nation, engendered a spirit of scepticism and infidelity, and formed a set of unhappy men, who employed all the wantonness of inconsiderate wit, all the sallies of imagination, and even all the force of real talent and genius to extinguish a sense of religion in the minds of mankind. That this complaint is far from being groundless, appears, on the one hand, from the number of those writers among the English, whose productions were levelled either against all religion, or designed to confine the belief of men to natural religion alone; and, on the other, from the still superiour number of learned and ingenious treatises in which the divinity, dignity, and intrinsic excellence of the Gospel were demonstrated and displayed in the most striking and conspicuous manner. But nothing is more adapted to confirm the accounts that have been given of the progress of infidelity and licentiousness at the period now under consideration, than the famous *Lectures*, founded by that illustrious ornament of religion and humanity, Mr. ROBERT BOYLE, who, in the year 1691, consecrated a considerable part of his large fortune to the service of Christianity, by leaving in his last will a sum to be distributed, successively, to a number of learned divines, who were to preach, in their turns, eight sermons, every year, in defence of natural and revealed religion [x]. This pious and honourable task has been committed always to men of the most eminent genius and abilities, and is still undertaken with zeal, and performed with remarkable dignity and success. The discourses, that have been delivered in consequence of this admirable institution, have been always published, and they form, at this day, a large and important collection, which is known throughout all *Europe*, and has done eminent service to the cause of religion and virtue [y].

Hobbes, Rochefter, &c.

XXII. The leader of the impious band in *England*, which, so early as the reign of CHARLES II, attempted to obscure the truth and to dissolve the solemn obligations of religion, was THOMAS HOBBS of *Malmesbury*, a man whose audacious pride was accompanied with an uncommon degree of artifice and address, whose sagacity was superior to his learning, and whose reputation was more owing to the subtilty and extent of his genius, than to any progress he had made either in sacred or profane erudition [z]. This man, notwithstanding the pernicious nature and tendency of his principles,

[x] See RICOTIER's *Preface* to his French translation of Dr. CLARKE's *Discourses on the Being and Attributes of God*. For an account of the pious, learned, and illustrious Mr. BOYLE, see BUDGELL's *Memoirs of the Lives and Characters of the illustrious Family of the BOYLE's*, published in 8^{vo} at London in the year 1737.—See also the *Bibliothèque Britannique*, tom. xii. p. 144.

[y] There is a complete list of these learned discourses in the *Bibliothèque Angloise*, tom. xv. part. II. p. 416.—The late Reverend Mr. GILBERT BURNET published, in four volumes in 8^{vo}, a judicious, comprehensive, and well-digested *Abridgment* of such of the BOYLE's *Lectures* as had been preached before the year 1737. This abridgment, which has been translated into the French and German languages, comprehends the discourses of Bentley, Kidder, Williams, Gastrell, Harris, Bradford, Blackball, Stanhope, Clarke, Hancock, Whiston, Turner, Butler, Woodward, Derham, Ibbot, Leng, J. Clarke, Gurdon, Burnet, Berriman.

[z] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article of HOBBS.—WOOD's *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. ii. p. 641. last edition.

had several adherents in *England*; and, not only so, but has found, in CENT. XVII. foreign countries, more than one apologist, who, though they acknowledge that his sentiments were erroneous, yet deny that he went such an impious length as to introduce the disbelief, or to overturn the worship of a supreme Being [a]. But if it should be granted, on the one hand, that HOBBS was not totally destitute of all sense of a Deity, nor of all impressions of religion; yet it must be allowed, on the other, by all who peruse his writings, with a proper degree of attention, that his tenets lead, by natural consequences, to a contempt of religion and of divine worship, and that, in some of his productions, there are visible marks of an extreme aversion to Christianity. It has, indeed, been said of him, that being advanced in years he returned to a better mind, and condemned publicly the opinions and tenets he had formerly entertained [b]; but how far this recantation was sincere we shall not pretend to determine, since the reality of his repentance has been greatly questioned.

The same thing cannot be said of JOHN WILMOT, earl of ROCHESTER, who had insulted the majesty of God, and trampled upon the truths of religion and the obligations of morality with a profane sort of frenzy, that far surpassed the impiety of HOBBS, but whose repentance and conversion were also as palpable as had been his folly, and much more unquestionable than

[a] Among the patrons and defenders of HOBBS, we may reckon NIC. HIER. GUNDLINGIUS, in his *Observationes Selectæ*, tom. i. n. ii. p. 30. and in his *Gundlingiana*, p. XIV. p. 304. as also ARNOLD, in his German work entitled, *Kirchen-und Ketzer Historie*, p. II. b xvii. c. xvi. § 25. p. 1082.—These writers are refuted by the learned BUDÆUS, in his *Theses de Atheismo et Superstitione*, cap. i. p. 187.

[b] This recantation of HOBBS depends upon the testimony of WOOD, in his *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. ii. p. 646. This writer informs us, that HOBBS composed an apology for himself and his writings, in which he declared, that the opinions, he had published in his *Leviathan*, were, by no means, conformable to his real sentiments: that he had only proposed them as a matter of debate to exercise his mind in the art of reasoning: that after the publication of that book he had never maintained them either in public or in private, but had left them entirely to the judgment and decision of the church: more especially, that the tenets, in this and his other writings, that seemed inconsistent with the doctrines concerning God and religion that are commonly received, were never delivered by him as *truths*, but proposed as *questions*, that were to be decided by divines and ecclesiastical judges endued with a proper authority.—Such is the account that WOOD gives of the *apology* now under consideration; but he does not tell us the year in which it was published, which is a proof that he, himself, had never seen it, nor does he inform us whether it appeared during the life of HOBBS, or after his death. As indeed it is placed in the catalogue of his writings, with a date posterior to the year 1682, it is natural to suppose that it was not published during his life, since he died in the year 1679. It is, therefore, no easy matter to determine what stress is to be laid upon this recantation of HOBBS, or what sentiments we are to form concerning his supposed repentance. That the *apology*, under consideration, exists, we do not pretend to deny; but it may possibly have been composed by some of his friends to diminish the *odium*, that, it was natural to think, his licentious principles would cast on his memory. But should it be granted, that it was drawn up and published by HOBBS himself, even this concession would contribute but little to save, or rather to recover, his reputation; since it is well known, that nothing is more common among those, who by spreading corrupt principles and pernicious opinions have drawn upon themselves the just indignation of the public, than, like HOBBS, to deceive the world by insidious and insincere declarations of the soundness of their belief, and the uprightness of their intentions. It is thus that they secure themselves against the execution of the laws that are designed to fence religion, while they persevere in their licentious sentiments, and propagate them, wherever they can do it with security.

the

CENT. XVII. the dubious recantation of the philosopher of *Malmesbury*. ROCHESTER was a man of uncommon sagacity and penetration, of a fine genius, and an elegant taste; but these natural talents were accompanied with the greatest levity and licentiousness, and the most impetuous propensity to unlawful pleasures. So that as long as health enabled him to answer the demands of passion, his life was an uninterrupted scene of debauchery [c]. He was, however, so happy, in the last years of a very short life, as to see the extreme folly and guilt of his past conduct, in which salutary view he was greatly assisted by the wise and pathetic reasonings and exhortations of doctor BURNET, afterwards bishop of *Sarum*. This conviction of his guilt produced a deep contrition and repentance, an ardent recourse to the mercy of God as it is manifested in the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST, and a sincere abhorrence of the offences he had committed against the best of Beings. In these pious sentiments he departed this life in the year 1680 [d].

In this list we may also place ANTHONY ASHLEY COOPER, earl of SHAFTESBURY, who died of a consumption at *Naples*, in the year 1703; not that this illustrious writer attacked openly and professedly the Christian religion, but that the most seducing strokes of wit and raillery, the most enchanting eloquence, and the charms of a genius, in which amenity, elegance, copiousness, and elevation were happily blended, rendered him one of its most dangerous, though secret enemies; nay, so much the more dangerous, because his opposition was carried on under a mask. His works have been published, and have passed through several editions. They are remarkable for beauty of diction, and contain very noble and sublime sentiments; but ought to be read with the utmost caution, as extremely dangerous to unexperienced, youthful, and unwary minds [e]. The brutal rusticity and

[c] See an account of his life and writings in WOOD's *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. ii. p. 654.—His poetical genius is justly celebrated by VOLTAIRE, in his *Melanges de Litterature et de Philosophie*, chap. xxxiv. vol. iv. of his works.

[d] Bishop BURNET has given a particular account of this last and very affecting scene of the life of this nobleman in a pamphlet written expressly on that subject, and entitled, *Some Passages of the Life and Death of John earl of Rochester, written at his desire, on his Death-bed*, by GILBERT BURNET, D. D. Containing more amply their Conversations on the great Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion.

[e] His works were first collected and published under the title of *Characteristics*, in three volumes in 8° in the year 1711, and, since that time, have passed through several editions. See LE CLERC's account of them in his *Bibliothèque Choïse*, tom. xxiii. The learned and ingenious LEIBNITZ's critical reflexions on the philosophy of Lord SHAFTESBURY, were published by DES MAIZEAU, in the second volume of his *Récueil des diverses Pièces sur la Philosophie*, p. 245.—There are some writers, who maintain that this noble philosopher has been unjustly charged, by the greatest part of the clergy, with a contempt for Revealed Religion; and it were to be wished that the arguments they employ to vindicate him from this charge were more satisfactory and solid than they really are. But, if I am not much mistaken, whoever peruses his writings, and more especially his famous letter concerning *Enthusiasm*, will be inclined to adopt the judgment that has been formed of him by the ingenious Dr. BERKLEY, late bishop of *Cloyne*, in his *Alciphron, or the Minute Philosopher*, vol. i. p. 200.—Nothing is more easy than to observe, in the writings of Lord SHAFTESBURY, a spirit of raillery, mingling itself with even those of his reflexions upon religious subjects that seem to be delivered with the greatest seriousness and gravity. But, at the same time, this unseemly mixture of the solemn and the ludicrous renders it difficult for those, that are not well acquainted with his manner, to know whether the man is in jest or in earnest. It uncouth

uncouth turn of JOHN TOLAND, a native of Ireland, who, towards the conclusion of this century, was rendered infamous by several injurious libels against Christianity, must naturally appear doubly disgusting, when compared with the amiable elegance and specious refinement of the writer now mentioned. However, as those writers, who flatter the passions by endeavouring to remove all the restraints that religion imposes upon their excessive indulgence, will never want patrons among the licentious part of mankind; so this man, who was not destitute of learning, imposed upon the ignorant and unwary; and, notwithstanding the excess of his arrogance and vanity, and the shocking rudeness and ferocity of his manners, acquired a certain measure of fame [f]. It is not necessary to mention other authors of this class, who appeared in England, during this century, but are long since consigned to oblivion; the reader may, however, add to those, that have been already named, Lord HERBERT of CHERBURY, a philosopher of some note, who, if he did not absolutely deny the divine origin of the

may be also added, that this author has perniciously endeavoured to destroy the influence and efficacy of some of the great motives that are proposed, in the Holy Scriptures, to render men virtuous, by representing these motives as mercenary, and even turning them into ridicule. He substitutes, in their place, the intrinsic excellence and beauty of virtue, as the great source of moral obligation, and the true incentive to virtuous deeds. But, however alluring this sublime scheme of morals may appear to certain minds of a refined, elegant, and ingenuous turn, it is certainly little adapted to the taste, the comprehension and character of the multitude. Take away from the lower orders of mankind the prospect of reward and punishment, that leads them to virtue and obedience by the powerful suggestions of hope and fear; and the great supports of virtue, and the most effectual motives to the pursuit of it, will be then removed with respect to them.

[Since Dr. MOSHEIM wrote this note, the very learned and judicious Dr. LELAND published his *View of the principal Deistical Writers that have appeared in England during the last and present Century*, &c. in which there is a full account of the Free-thinkers and Deists mentioned by our historian, and a review of the writings of the earl of SHAFTESBURY. This review merits a particular attention, as it contains an impartial account, an accurate examination, and a satisfactory refutation of the erroneous principles of that great man. Lord SHAFTESBURY, like all other eminent innovators, has been misrepresented both by his friends and his enemies. Dr. LELAND has steered a middle course between the blind enthusiasm of the former, and the partial malignity of the latter. He points out, with singular penetration and judgment, the errors, inconsistencies, and contradictions of that illustrious author, does justice to what is good in his ingenious writings, separates carefully the wheat from the chaff, and neither approves nor condemns in the lump, as too many have done. In a more particular manner he has shewn, with his usual perspicuity and good sense, that the being influenced by the hope of the reward promised in the Gospel has nothing in it *disingenuous* and *flavish*, and is so far from being inconsistent with loving virtue *for its own sake*, that it tends, on the contrary, to heighten our esteem of its *amiableness* and *worth*.—The triumphant manner in which the learned Dr. WARBURTON has refuted SHAFTESBURY's representation of raillery and ridicule as a test of truth, is too well known to be mentioned here. See also Dr. BROWN's *Three Essays on the Characteristicks*, in which that sensible author treats of *Ridicule*, considered as a *Test of Truth*: of the obligations of men to virtue, and of the necessity of religious Principle, and of Revealed Religion and Christianity.]

[(f) Dr. MOSHEIM quotes here, in a short note, an account he had given of the *Life and Writings of Toland*, prefixed to his confutation of the NAZARENUS of that contemptible author. He also quotes a *Life of Toland*, prefixed to his *Posthumous Works*, printed in 8° at London, in 1726, by DES MAIZEAUX.—Dr. MOSHEIM says, that this man *was not destitute of learning*. Should that be granted, it must, nevertheless, be acknowledged, that this learning lay quite indigested in his head, and that the use he made of it in his works was equally injudicious and impudent. His conference with M. BEAUSOBRE, concerning the *Authenticity* of the Holy Scriptures, which was held at *Berlin*, in the year 1701, in presence of the queen of *Prussia*, and in which he

Gospel [g], maintained, at least, that it was not essentially necessary to the

made such a despicable figure, is a proof of the former, and his writings to all but half-scholars and half-thinkers will be a proof (as long as they endure) of the latter. — It is remarkable, that, according to that maxim of JUVENAL, *Nemo repente fuit turpissimus*, TOLAND arrived only gradually, and by a progressive motion at the summit of infidelity. His first step was Socinianism, which appeared in his book, intitled, *Christianity not Mystical*. This book procured him hard treatment from the Irish parliament; and was answered by Mr. BROWN, afterwards bishop of Cork, who, unhappily, did not think good arguments sufficient to maintain a good cause, unless they were seconded by the secular arm, whose ill-placed succours he solicited with ardor. The second step, that TOLAND made, in the devious wilds of irreligion, was in the publication of his *Amyntor*, which, in appearance, was designed to vindicate what he had advanced in his *Life of MILTON*, to prove that King CHARLES I was not the real author of the *Eikon Basilike*, but, in reality, was intended to invalidate the *Canon of the New Testament*, and to render it uncertain and precarious. This piece, in as far as it attacked the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures, was answered in a triumphant manner by Dr. CLARKE, in his *Reflections on that part of the Book called AMYNTOR, which relates to the Writings of the Primitive Fathers, and the Canon of the New Testament*; by Mr. RICHARDSON, in his learned and judicious *Vindication of the Canon of the New Testament*; and by Mr. JONES, in his *New and full method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament*. These learned writers have exposed, in the most striking manner, the dissimulation, the blunders, the false quotations, the insidious fictions and ridiculous mistakes of TOLAND, who, on various accounts, may pass for one of the most harmless writers against the Christian religion. For an account of the *Adeisdemon*, the *Nazarenus*, the *Letters to Serena*, the *Pantheisticon*, and the other irreligious works of this author, with the excellent answers that have been made to them; see his *Life* in the *General Dictionary*, or rather in CHAUFFEPED's Supplement to BAYLE's *Dictionary*, entitled, *Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*, as this author has not only translated the articles added to BAYLE's *Dictionary* by the English editors of that work, but has augmented and improved them by several interesting anecdotes drawn from the Literary History of the Continent.]

[(g) Lord HERBERT did not pretend to deny the divinity of the Gospel; he even declared, that he had no intention to attack Christianity, which he calls, in express terms, the *Best Religion*, and which, according to his own confession, tends to establish the five great articles of that universal, sufficient and absolutely-perfect religion, which he pretends to deduce from reason and nature. But notwithstanding these fair professions, his lordship loses no occasion of throwing out insinuations against all Revealed Religion, as absolutely uncertain and of little or no use. But this same Deist, who was the first and, indeed, the least contemptible of that tribe in England, has left upon record one of the strongest instances of fanaticism and absurdity that perhaps ever has been heard of, and of which he, himself, was guilty. This instance is preserved in a manuscript-life of Lord HERBERT, drawn up from memorials penned by himself, which is now in the possession of a gentleman of distinction, and is as follows: That lord having finished his book *de Veritate*, apprehended that he should meet with much opposition, and was, consequently, dubious for some time, whether it would not be prudent to suppress it. "Being thus doubtful, says his lordship, in my chamber (at Paris, where he was ambassador in the year 1624) one fair day in the summer, my casement being open towards the south, the sun shining clear, and no wind stirring, I took my book, *de Veritate*, in my hands, and kneeling on my knees, devoutly said these words: O thou eternal God, author of this light, that now shines upon me, and giver of all inward illuminations; I do beseech thee, of thine infinite goodness, to pardon a greater request than a sinner ought to make: I am not satisfied enough, whether I shall publish this book: if it be for thy glory, I beseech thee give me some sign from heaven; if not, I shall suppress it." What does the reader now think of this corner-stone of Deism, who demands a supernatural Revelation from heaven in favour of a book, that was designed to prove all Revelation uncertain and useless? But the absurdity does not end here, for our Deist not only sought for this Revelation, but also obtained it, if we are to believe him. Let us, at least, hear him. "I had no sooner, says he, spoken these words, but a loud, though yet gentle noise came forth from the heavens (for it was like nothing on earth) which did so cheer and comfort me, that I took my petition as granted." Rare credulity this in an unbeliever! but these gentlemen can believe like their neighbours when it answers their purpose. His lordship continues, "This, however strange it may seem, I protest before the eternal God is true; neither am I superstitiously deceived herein," &c. See LELAND's *View of the Distinct Writers*, &c. vol. i. p. 470, &c.]

salvation

salvation of mankind [b]; and CHARLES BLOUNT, who composed a book, CENT. XVII. entitled, *The Oracles of Reason*, and, in the year 1693, died by his own hand [i].

XXIII. Infidelity and even Atheism shewed themselves also on the continent during this century. In France JULIUS CÆSAR VANINI, the author of two books, the one, entitled, *The Amphitheatre of Providence* [k], and the other *Dialogues concerning Nature* [l], was publicly burnt, at *Tbolouse*, in the year 1629, as an impious and obstinate Atheist. It is nevertheless to be observed, that several learned and respectable writers consider this unhappy man rather as a victim to bigotry and envy than as a martyr to impiety and Atheism, and maintain, that neither his life nor his writings were so absurd or blasphemous as to entitle him to the character of a despiser of God and religion [m]. But if VANINI had his apologists, this was, by no means, the case of COSMO RUGGERI, a native of *Florence*, whose Atheism, was as impudent, as it was impious, and who died, in the most desperate

Vanini, Rugger, Leszynski, Knutzen.

[b] This is sufficiently known to those who have perused Lord HERBERT's book *De causis errorum*, as also his celebrated work *De religione Gentilium*. This author is generally considered as the chief and founder of the sect or society that are called *Naturalists* from their attachment to Natural Religion alone. See ARNOLDI *Historia Ecclesiastica et Hæret.* part. II. p. 1083.—The peculiar tenets of this famous Deist have been refuted by MUSÆUS and KORTHOLT, two German divines of eminent learning and abilities.—[GASSENDI also composed an answer to Lord HERBERT's book *De Veritate*. In England it was refuted by Mr. RICHARD BAXTER in a treatise, entitled, *More reasons for the Christian Religion, and no reason against it*. M. LOCKE, in his *Essay on Human Understanding*, shews, with great perspicuity and force of evidence, that the *Five Articles of Natural Religion* proposed by this noble author, are not, as he represents them, *Common Notices*, clearly inscribed by the hand of God in the minds of all men, and that a Divine Revelation is necessary to indicate, develope, and enforce them. Dr. WHITBY has also treated the same matter amply in his learned work, entitled, *The Necessity and Usefulness of the Christian Revelation, by reason of the Corruptions of the Principles of Natural Religion among Jews and Heathens*, 8^{vo} 1705.]

[i] See CHAUFFEPIED, *Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique et Crit.* though this author has omitted the mention of this gentleman's unhappy fate, out of a regard no doubt to his illustrious family. [Mr. CHAUFFEPIED has done no more than translate the article CHARLES BLOUNT from that of the English continuators of BAYLE.]

[(k) This book was published at Lyons in the year 1615, was approved by the clergy and magistrates of that city, and contains many things absolutely irreconcilable with atheistical principles; its title is as follows: *Amphitheatrum æternæ Providentiæ, Divino-Magicum, Christiano-Physicum, Astrologico-Catholicum, adversus veteres Philosophos, Atheos, Epicureos, Peripateticos, Stoicos, &c.* This book has been esteemed innocent by several writers, impious by others; but, in our judgment, it would have escaped reproach, had VANINI published none of his other productions, since the impieties it may contain, according to the intention of its author, are carefully concealed. This is by no means the case of the book mentioned in the following note.]

[(l) This book concerning the *Secrets of Queen Nature the Goddess of Mortals* was published with this suspicious title at Paris, in the year 1616, and contains glaring marks of impiety and atheism. And yet it was published with the king's permission and the approbation of the *Faculty of Theology* at Paris. This scandalous negligence or ignorance is unaccountable in such a reverend body. The Jesuit GARASSE pretends that the Faculty was deceived by VANINI, who substituted another treatise in the place of that, which had been approved. See a wretched book of GARASSE, entitled, *Doctrine Curieuse*, p. 998. as also DURAND, *Vie de Vanini*, p. 116.]

[m] See BUDÆUS's *Theses de Atheismo et Superstitione*, p. 120. The author of the *Apologia pro VANINO*, which appeared in Holland in the year 1712, is PETER FREDERICK ARP, a learned lawyer, who, in his *Feriæ æstivales seu Scriptorum suorum Historia*, p. 28. has promised a new edition of this Apology with considerable additions. We may also place among the defenders of VANINI, the learned ELIAS FREDERICK HEISTER, in his *Apologia pro Medicis*, sect. xviii. p. 93.

CENT. XVII. sentiments of irreligion at *Paris* in the year 1615, declaring that he looked upon all the accounts that had been given of the existence of a supreme Being and of evil spirits as idle dreams [n]. CASIMIR LESZYNSKI, a Polish knight, was capitally punished, suffered death at *Warsaw*, in the year 1689, for denying the Being and Providence of God; but whether or no this accusation was well founded, can only be known by reading his trial, and examining the nature and circumstances of the evidence that was produced against him [o]. In *Germany*, a senseless and frantic sort of a man called MATTHEW KNUTZEN, a native of *Holstein*, attempted to found a new sect, whose members, laying aside all consideration of *God* and *Religion*, were to follow the dictates of *reason* and *conscience* alone, and from thence were to assume the title of *Conscientiarians*. But this wrong-headed sectary was easily obliged to abandon his extravagant undertakings, and thus his idle attempt came to nothing [p].

Benedict Spinoza.

XXIV. The most acute and eminent of the Atheists, of this century, whose system represented the supreme author of all things, as a Being bound by the external and immutable laws of necessity or fate, was BENEDICT SPINOZA, a Portuguese Jew. This man, who died at the *Hague* in the year 1677, observed, in his conduct, the rules of wisdom and probity, much better than many who profess themselves Christians, nor did he ever endeavour to pervert the sentiments or to corrupt the morals of those with whom he lived, or to inspire, in his discourse, a contempt of religion or virtue [q]. It is true, indeed, that in his writings, more especially in those that were published after his death, he maintains openly, that *God* and the *Universe* are one and the same Being, and that all things happen by the eternal and immutable law of *nature*, i. e. of an all-comprehending and infinite Being, that exists and acts by an *invincible necessity*. This doctrine leads directly to consequences equally impious and absurd; for if the principle, now mentioned, be true, each individual is his own God, or, at least, a part of the universal Deity, and is, therefore, impeccable and perfect [r].

[n] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article RUGGERI.

[o] See the German work of ARNOLD, entitled, *Kirchen en Ketzer Historie*, p. 1077.—There was formerly in the famous library of UFFENBACH a complete collection of all the papers relating to the trial of LESZYNSKY, and a full account of the proceedings against him.

[p] See MOLLERI *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. i. p. 304. & *Isagoge ad Historiam Chersones. Cimbr.* part. II. cap. vi. § viii. p. 164.—LA CROZE *Entretiens sur divers sujets d'Histoire*, p. 400.

[q] The Life of SPINOZA has been accurately written by COLERUS, whose performance was published at the *Hague* in 8^{vo} in the year 1706. But a more ample and circumstantial account of this singular man has been given by LENGLET DU FRESNOY, and is prefixed to BOULAINVILLIERS's Exposition of the Doctrine of SPINOZA, which was published at *Amsterdam*, under the title of *Brussels*, in 12^{mo} in the year 1731. See also BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article SPINOZA. [LENGLET DU FRESNOY republished the Work of COLERUS, and added to it several anecdotes and circumstances, borrowed from a *Life of Spinoza*, written by an infamous profligate whose name was LUCAS, and who practised physic at the *Hague*. See below the notes [x] and [y].

[r] The learned FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Græca*, lib. v. part. III. p. 119. and JENICHEN, in his *Historia Spinozismi Lebnhofiani*, p. 58—72. have given us an ample list of the writers, who have refuted the system of SPINOZA. The real opinion, which this subtle sophist entertained concerning the Deity, is to be learned in his *Ethicks*, that were published after his death, and not in his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, which was printed during his life. For in this latter

Be that as it may, it is evident that SPINOZA was seduced into this monstrous system by the Cartesian philosophy, of which he was a passionate admirer, and which was the perpetual subject of his meditation and study. Having adopted that general principle, about which philosophers of all sects are agreed; *that all realities are professed by the Deity in the most eminent degree*; and having added to this principle, as equally evident, the opinion of DESCARTES, *that there are only two realities in nature, thought and extension, the one essential to spirit, and the other to matter* [s]; the natural consequence of this was, that he should attribute to the Deity both these realities, even *thought and extension* in an eminent degree, or, in other words, should represent them as *infinite and immense* in God. Hence the transition seemed easy enough to that enormous system, which confounds God with the *Universe*, represents them as one and the same Being, and supposes only one *substance* from whence all things proceed and into which they all return. It is natural to observe here, what even the friends of SPINOZA are obliged to acknowledge, that this system is neither attended with that luminous perspicuity, nor that force of evidence, that are proper to make proselytes. It is too dark, too intricate to allure men from the belief of those truths, relating to the Deity, which the works of nature and the plainest dictates of reason are perpetually enforcing upon the human mind. Accordingly, the followers of SPINOZA tell us without hesitation, that it is rather by the suggestions of a certain *sense*, than by the investigations of reason, that his doctrine is to be comprehended, and that it is of such a nature, as to be easily misunderstood even by persons of the greatest sagacity and penetra-

Treatise he reasons like one, who was persuaded, that there exists an *eternal Deity*, distinct from *matter* and the *universe*, who has sent upon earth a religion designed to form men to the practice of benevolence and justice, and has confirmed that religion by events of a *wonderful and astonishing*, though not of a *supernatural* kind. But, in his *Ethicks*, he throws off the mask, explains clearly his sentiments, and endeavours to demonstrate, that the *Deity* is nothing more than the *universe*, producing a series of necessary movements or acts in consequence of its own *intrinsic, immutable, and irresistible energy*. This diversity of sentiments, that appears in the different productions of SPINOZA, is a sufficient refutation of those, who, forming their estimate of his system from his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* alone, pronounce it less pernicious and its author less impious than they are generally supposed to be. But, on the other hand, how shall this diversity be accounted for? Are we to suppose that SPINOZA proceeded to atheism by gradual steps, or is it rather more probable, that, during his life, he prudently concealed his real sentiments? Which of these two is the case, it is not easy to determine; it appears, however, from testimonies, every way worthy of credit, that he never, during his whole life, either made, or attempted to make, converts to irreligion, never said any thing in public that tended to encourage disrespectful sentiments of the supreme Being, or of the worship that is due to him; nay, it is well known, on the contrary, that, when subjects of a religious nature were incidentally treated in the course of conversation where he was present, he always expressed himself with the utmost decency on the occasion, and often with an air of piety and seriousness that was more adapted to edify than to give offence. See DES MAIZEAUX *Vie de M. de S. Evremond*, p. cxvii. tom. i. of his works. This appears also evident from the *Lettres* that are published in his posthumous works.

[s] The hypothesis of DES CARTES, is not perhaps represented with sufficient accuracy and precision, by saying that he looked upon *thought* as *essential to spirit*, and *extension* as *essential to matter*; since it is well known, that this philosopher considered *thought* as the very *essence* or *substance* of the *soul*, and *extension* as the very *essence* and *substance* of *matter*.]

tion.

CENT. XVII. tion [t]. The disciples of SPINOZA assume the denomination of Pantheists, choosing rather to derive their distinctive title from the nature of their doctrine, than from the name of their master [u]. The most noted members of this strange sect were, a physician, whose name was LEWIS MEIER [w],

[t] There is certainly no man so little acquainted with the character of BAYLE, as to think him void of discernment and sagacity; and yet this most subtle metaphysician has been accused by the followers of SPINOZA of misunderstanding and misrepresenting the doctrine of that Pantheist, and consequently of answering it with very little solidity. See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article SPINOZA. This charge is brought against BAYLE, with peculiar severity, by L. MEIER, in his Preface to the Posthumous Works of SPINOZA, in which, after complaining of the misrepresentations that have been given of the opinions of that writer, he pretends to maintain, that his system was, in every point, conformable to the doctrines of Christianity. BOULAINVILLIERS, also, another of SPINOZA's commentators and advocates, declares, in his Preface to a book whose perfidious title is mentioned below in note [y], that all the antagonists of that famous Jew either ignorantly misunderstood or maliciously perverted his true doctrine; his words are: *Les Refutations de Spinoza m'ont induit à juger, ou que leurs Auteurs n'avoient pas voulu mettre la doctrine, qu'ils combattent, dans une évidence suffisante, ou qu'ils l'avoient mal entendue*, p. 153.—But now if this be true, if the doctrine of SPINOZA be not only far beyond the comprehension of the vulgar, but also difficult to be understood, and liable to be mistaken and misrepresented by men of the most acute parts and the most eminent abilities, what is the most obvious conclusion deducible from this fact? It is plainly this, that the greatest part of the Spinofists, whose sect is supposed by some to be very numerous in Europe, have adopted the doctrine of that famous Atheist, not so much from a conviction of its truth, founded on an examination of its intricate contents, as from the pleasure they take in a system, that promises impunity to all transgressions, that do not come within the cognizance of the civil laws, and thus lets loose the reins to every irregular appetite and passion. For it would be senseless, in the highest degree, to imagine, that the pretended multitude of the Spinofists, many of whom never once dreamed of exercising their minds in the pursuit of truth, or accustoming them to philosophical discussion, should, all, accurately comprehend a system, which, according to their own accounts, has escaped the penetration and sagacity of the greatest geniuses.

[u] TOLAND, unable to purchase himself a dinner, composed and published, in order to supply the sharp demands of hunger, an infamous and impious book under the following title: *Pantheisticon, sive, Formula celebrandæ Societatis Socraticæ in tres Particulas divisæ, quæ PANTHEISTARUM, sive sodalium continent*, I. *Mores et Axiomata*. II. *Numen et Philosophiam*. III. *Libertatem et non fallentem legem neque fallendam*, &c. The design of this book, which was published in 8^o at London in the year 1720, appears by the title. It was intended to draw a picture of the licentious morals and principles of his brethren the Pantheists under the fictitious description of a Socratical society, which they are represented as holding in all the places where they are dispersed. In the Socratical, or rather Bacchanalian society described in this pernicious work, the president and members are said to converse freely on several subjects. There is also a *Form* or *Liturgy* read by the president, who officiates as priest, and is answered by the assembly in suitable *responses*. He recommends earnestly to the members of the society the care of truth, liberty, and health, exhorts them to guard against superstition, that is, religion, and reads aloud to them, by way of *Lessons*, certain select passages out of CICERO and SENECA, which seem to favour irreligion. His colleagues promise solemnly to conform themselves to his injunctions and exhortations. Sometimes the whole fraternity is so animated with enthusiasm and joy, that they all raise their voices together and sing certain verses out of the ancient Latin poets, that are suitable to the laws and principles of their sect. See DES MAIZEAUX *Life of John Toland*, p. 77.—*Bibliothèque Angloise*, tom. viii. part. II. p. 285. If the Pantheistical community be really such, as it is here represented, it is not so much the duty of wise and good men to dispute with or refute its members, as it is the business of the civil magistrate to prevent such licentious and turbulent spirits from troubling the order of society, and seducing honest citizens from their religious principles and the duties of their respective stations.

[w] This MEIER was the person, who translated into Latin the pieces that SPINOZA had composed in the Dutch language, who assisted him in his last moments after having attempted, in vain, to remove his disorder, and who published his *Posthumous Works* with a *Preface*, in which, with a certain

a certain person called LUCAS [x], Count BOULAINVILLIERS [y], and some others equally contemptible on account of their sentiments and morals. CENT. XVII.

XXV. The progressive and flourishing state of the arts and sciences in the seventeenth century is abundantly known; and we see the effects and enjoy the fruits of the efforts then made for the advancement of learning. No

The sciences cultivated and improved.

great impudence and little success, he endeavours to prove that the doctrine of SPINOZA differs, in nothing, from that of the Gospel. MEIER is also the author of a well-known treatise, thus entitled, *Philosophia Scripturæ Interpres*, Eleutheropoli, 1666, in 4^{to}. in which the merit and authority of the sacred writings are examined by the dictates of philosophy, that is to say, of the philosophy of Mr. MEIER.

[x] LUCAS was a physician at the Hague, and was as famous for what he called his Quintessences, as he was infamous on account of the profligacy of his morals. He left behind him a *Life of Spinoza*, from whence LENGLET DU FRESNOY took all the additions that he made to the *Life of that Atheist* written by COLERUS. He also composed a work, which is still handed about and bought, at an extravagant price, by those in whose judgment rarity and impiety are equivalent to merit. This work is entitled, *L'Esprit de Spinoza*, and surpasses infinitely in atheistical profaness, even those productions of SPINOZA, that are looked upon as the most pernicious; so far has this miserable writer lost sight of every dictate of prudence, and triumphed even over the restraints of shame.

[y] This fertile and copious, but paradoxical and inconsiderate writer is abundantly known by his various productions relating to the History and Political State of the French Nation, by a certain prolix Fable, entitled, *The Life of Mahomet*, and by the adverse turns of fortune that pursued him. His character was so made up of inconsistencies and contradictions, that he is almost equally chargeable with superstition and atheism. For, though he acknowledged no other Deity than the universe, or nature, yet he looked upon MAHOMET as authorized, by a divine commission, to instruct mankind; and he was of opinion, that the fate of nations and the destiny of individuals could be foreknown by an attentive observation of the stars. Thus the man was, at the same time, an atheist and an astrologer. Now this medley of a man was greatly concerned, in consequence, forsooth, of his ardent zeal for the public good, to see the admirable doctrine of SPINOZA so generally misunderstood, and, therefore, he formed the laudable design of expounding, illustrating, and accommodating it, as is done in books of piety, to ordinary capacities. This design, indeed, he executed; but not so fortunately for his matter as he might fondly imagine; since it appeared most evidently, from his own account of the system of SPINOZA, that BAYLE and the other writers, who had represented his doctrine as repugnant to the plainest dictates of reason and utterly destructive of all religion, had judged rightly, and were neither misled by ignorance nor temerity. In short, the book of BOULAINVILLIERS set the atheism and impiety of SPINOZA in a much more clear and striking light than ever they had appeared before. This infamous book, which was worthy of eternal oblivion, was published by LENGLET DU FRESNOY, who, that it might be bought with avidity and read without reluctance, prefixed to it the attracting, but perfidious title of *A Refutation of the Errors of Spinoza*, adding, indeed, to it some separate pieces, to which this title may, in some measure, be thought applicable: the whole title runs thus: *Refutation des Erreurs de Benoit de Spinoza, par M. de Fenelon, Archevêque de Cambrai, par le Pere Lami Benedictin, et par M. le Comte de Boulainvilliers, avec la Vie de Spinoza, écrite par Jean Colerus ministre de l'Eglise Lutherienne de la Haye, augmentée de beau coup de particularités tirées d'une Vie Manuscrite de ce Philosophe, faite par un de ses Amis* (this friend was LUCAS the atheistical physician mentioned in the preceding note) à Bruxelles chez François Foppens, 1731, in 12^{mo}. Here we see the poison and the antidote joined together; but the latter perfidiously distributed in a manner and measure every way insufficient to remove the noxious effects of the former: in a word, the wolf is shut up with the sheep. The account and defence of the philosophy of SPINOZA, given by BOULAINVILLIERS under the insidious title of a *Refutation*, takes up the greatest part of this book, and is placed first, and not last in order, as the title would insinuate. Besides, the whole contents of this motley collection are not enumerated in the title; for at the end of it we find a Latin Treatise, entitled, *Certamen Philosophicum propugnatae Veritatis divinæ et naturalis adversus Jo. BREDENBURGII principia, in fine annexa*. This philosophical controversy contains a defence of the doctrine of SPINOZA, by BREDENBURG; and a Refutation of that defence by ISAAC OROBIO, a learned Jewish physician at Amsterdam, and was first published in 8^{vo} in the year 1703.

branch

CENT. XVII. branch of literature seemed to be neglected. Logic, philosophy, history, poetry, and rhetoric, in a word, all the sciences that belong to the respective provinces of reason, experience, observation, genius, memory, and imagination, were cultivated and improved with remarkable success throughout the Christian world. While the learned men of this happy period discovered such zeal for the improvement of science, their zeal was both enflamed and directed by one of the greatest and rarest geniuses that ever arose for the instruction of mankind. This was FRANCIS BACON, Lord VERULAM, who, towards the commencement of this century, opened the paths, that lead to true philosophy, in his admirable works [z]. It must be acknowledged, indeed, that the rules, he prescribes to direct the researches of the studious, are not, all, practicable, amidst the numerous prejudices and impediments, to which the most zealous inquirers are exposed in the pursuit of truth; and it appears, plainly, that this great man, to whose elevated and comprehensive genius all things seemed easy, was, at certain times, so far carried away by the vastness of his conceptions, as to require from the application and abilities of men more than they were capable of performing, and to desire the *end* without always examining whether the *means* of attaining it were possible. At the same time it must be confessed, that a great part of the improvements in learning, and of the progress in science that were made in *Europe*, during this century, was owing to the counsels and directions of this extraordinary man. This is more especially true of the improvements that were made in natural philosophy, to which noble science BACON did such important service, as is, alone, sufficient to render his name immortal. He opened the eyes of those, who had been led blindfold by the dubious authority of traditionary systems, and the uncertain directory of hypothesis and conjecture. He led them to nature, that they might consult that oracle directly and near at hand, and receive her answers; and by the introduction of experimental inquiry he placed philosophy upon a new and solid basis. It was thus, undoubtedly, that he removed the prejudices of former times, which led men to consider all human knowledge as circumscribed within the bounds of Greek and Latin erudition, and an acquaintance with the more elegant and liberal arts; and thus in the vast regions of nature he opened scenes of instruction and science, which, although hitherto unknown or disregarded, were infinitely more noble and sublime, and much more productive of solid nourishment to the minds of the wise, than that kind of learning that was in vogue before his time.

More especially
the mathematics.

XXVI. It is remarkable, in general, that the science of *natural philosophy*, *mathematics*, and *astronomy* were carried, in this century, in all the nations of *Europe*, to such a high degree of perfection, that they seemed to rise, all of a

[z] More especially in his Treatise *De dignitate et augmentis Scientiarum*, and in his *Novum Organum*. See the Life of that great man, that is prefixed to the last edition of his Works, published by Millar in four volumes *in folio*.—*Bibliothèque Britannique*, tom. xv. p. 128.—In Mr. MALLET's Life of BACON there is a particular and interesting account of his noble attempt to reform the miserable philosophy that prevailed before his time. See also VOLTAIRE *Melange de Literature*, &c. in the fourth volume of his Works, chap. xiv. p. 225.

sudden, from the puny weakness of infancy to a state of full maturity. CENT. XVII.
 There is, certainly, no sort of comparison between the philosophers, mathematicians, and astronomers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The former look like pigmies, when compared with the gigantic stature of the latter. At the head of these latter appears GALILEI, the ornament of natural science in *Italy*, who was encouraged, in his astronomical researches and discoveries, by the munificence and protection of the Grand Dukes of *Tuscany* [a]. After this arose, in *France*, DESCARTES and GASCENDI, who left behind them a great number of eminent disciples; in *Denmark*, TYCHO BRAHE; in *England* BOYLE and NEWTON; in *Germany* KEPLER, HEVELIUS and LEIBNITZ; and in *Switzerland* the two BERNOULLI. These philosophers of the first magnitude, if I may use that expression, excited such a spirit of emulation in *Europe*, and were followed by such a multitude of admirers and rivals, that, if we except those countries that had not yet emerged from a state of ignorance and barbarism, there was scarcely any nation, that could not boast of possessing a profound mathematician, a famous astronomer, or an eminent philosopher. Nor were the dukes of *Tuscany*, however distinguished by their hereditary zeal for the sciences and their liberality to the learned, the only patrons of philosophy at this time; since it is well known, that the monarchs of *Great Britain* and *France*, CHARLES II, and LEWIS XIV, honoured the sciences and those that cultivated them with their protection and encouragement. It is to the munificence of these two princes, that the *Royal Society of London*, and the *Academy of Sciences at Paris*, owe their origin and establishment, their privileges, honours, and endowments; and that we, of consequence, are indebted for the interesting discoveries that have been made by these two learned bodies, the end of whose institution is the study and investigation of nature, and the culture of all those arts and sciences, that lead to truth, and are useful to mankind [b]. These establishments, and the inquiries they were so naturally adapted to encourage and promote, proved not only beneficial, in the highest degree, to the civil interests of mankind, but were, also, productive of inestimable advantages to the cause of true religion. By these inquiries, the empire of superstition, which is always the bane of genuine piety, and often a source of rebellion and calamity in sovereign states, was greatly shaken; by them the fictitious prodigies, that had so long held miserable mortals in a painful state of servitude and terror, were deprived of their influence; by them natural religion was built upon solid foundations, and illustrated with admirable perspicuity and

[a] See HEUMAN'S *Acta Philosoph.* part. XIV. p. 261. part. XV. p. 467. part. XVII. p. 803.

[b] The History of the *Royal Society of London*, was published by Dr. SPRAT in 4^{to} in the year 1722 *. See the *Biblioth. Angloise*, tom. xi. p. 1. The History of the *Academy of Paris* has been composed by FONTENELLE. The reader will find a comparison between these two learned bodies in the fourth volume of the Works of VOLTAIRE, entitled, *Melanges de Litterature et de Philosophie*, chap. xxvi. p. 317.

[* A much more interesting and ample History of this respectable society has lately been composed and published by Dr. BIRCH, its learned secretary.]

CENT. XVII. evidence; as, by them, the infinite perfections of the Supreme Being were demonstrated with the utmost clearness and force, from the frame of the universe in general, and also from the structure of its various parts.

History.

XXVII. The improvements made in History, and, more especially, the new degrees of light that were thrown upon the ancient History of the church, were of eminent service to the cause of genuine Christianity. For thus the original sources and reasons of many absurd opinions and institutions, which antiquity and custom had rendered sacred, were discovered and exposed in their proper colours; and innumerable errors, that had possessed and perplexed the anxious spirits of the credulous and superstitious multitude, were happily deprived of their authority and influence. Thus, of consequence, the chearful light of truth, and the calm repose and tranquillity that attend it, arose upon the minds of many, and human life was delivered from the crimes, that have been sanctified by superstition, and from the tumults and agitations in which it has so often involved unhappy mortals. The advantages that flowed from the improvement of historical knowledge are both innumerable and inestimable. By this many pious and excellent persons, whom ignorance or malice had branded with the ignominious title of *Heretics*, were delivered from reproach, recovered their good fame, and thus were secured against the malignity of superstition. By this it appeared, that many of those religious controversies, which had divided nations, friends, and families, and involved so often sovereign states in blood-shed, rebellion, and crimes of the most horrid kind, were owing to the most trifling and contemptible causes, to the ambiguity and obscurity of certain theological phrases and terms, to superstition, ignorance, and envy, to ghostly pride and ambition. By this it was demonstrated, with the fullest evidence, that many of those religious rites and ceremonies, which had been long considered as of divine institution, were derived from the most inglorious sources, being either borrowed from the manners and customs of barbarous nations, or invented, with a design to deceive the ignorant and credulous, or dictated by the idle visions of senseless enthusiasm. By this the ambitious intrigues of the bishops and other ministers of religion, who by perfidious arts had encroached upon the prerogatives of the throne, usurped a considerable part of its authority and revenues, and held princes in subjection to their yoke by terrors of the church, were brought to light. And, to mention no more instances, it was by the lamp of History, that those councils, whose decrees had so long been regarded as infallible and sacred, and revered as the dictates of celestial wisdom, were exhibited to the attentive observer, as assemblies, where an odious mixture of ignorance and knavery very frequently presided. Our happy experience, in these latter times, furnishes daily instances of the salutary effects of these important discoveries on the state of the Christian church, and on the condition of all its members. Hence flow that lenity and moderation that are mutually exercised by those who differ from one another in their religious sentiments; that prudence and caution that are used in estimating opinions and deciding controversies; that protection and support that are granted to men of worth, when attacked by the malice

malice of bigotry; and that visible diminution of the errors, frauds, crimes, and cruelties, with which superstition formerly imbittered the pleasures of human life, and the enjoyments of social intercourse. CENT. XVII.

XXVIII. Many of the doctors of this century applied themselves, with eminent success, to the study of Hebrew and Greek literature, and of the Oriental languages and antiquities. And as their progress in these kinds of erudition was rapid, so, in many instances, was the use, they made of them, truly excellent and laudable. For by these succours they were enabled to throw light on many difficult passages of the sacred writings, that had been ill understood, and injudiciously applied, and which some had even employed in supporting erroneous opinions, and giving a plausible colour to pernicious doctrines. Hence it happened, that many patrons and promoters of popular notions and visionary and groundless fancies were deprived of the fallacious arguments by which they maintained their errors. It cannot also be denied, that the cause of religion received considerable benefit from the labours of those, who, either endeavoured to preserve the purity and elegance of the Latin language, or who, beholding with emulation the example of the French, employed their industry in improving and polishing the languages of their respective countries. For it must be, evidently, both honourable and advantageous to the Christian church to have always, in its bosom, men of learning, qualified to write and discourse upon theological subjects with precision, elegance, ease, and perspicuity, that so the ignorant and perverse may be allured to receive instruction, and also be able to comprehend with facility the instructions they receive.

The study of
eloquence and
the languages.

XXIX. The rules of morality and practice, which were laid down in the sacred writings, by CHRIST and his apostles, assumed an advantageous form, received new illustrations, and were supported, upon new and solid principles, when that great system of law, that results from the constitution of nature, and the dictates of right reason, began to be studied with more diligence, and investigated with more accuracy and perspicuity, than had been the case in preceding ages. In this sublime study of the *law of nature*, the immortal GROTIUS led the way in his excellent book *Concerning the Rights of War and Peace*; and such was the dignity and importance of the subject, that his labours excited the zeal and emulation of men of the most eminent genius and abilities [c], who turned their principal attention to this noble science. How much the labours of these great men contributed to assist the ministers of the Gospel, both in their discourses and writings concerning the duties and obligations of Christians, may be easily seen by comparing the books of a practical kind that have been published since the period, now under consideration, with those, that were in vogue before that time. [There is scarcely a discourse upon any subject of Christian morality, how inconsiderable soever it may be, that does not bear some marks of the improvement, which was introduced into the science of morals by those great

The law of na-
ture is studied
with attention.

[c] See ADAM. FRID. GLAFEY, *Historia Juris Naturæ*, to which is subjoined his *Bibliotheca Juris Naturæ et Gentium*.

CENT. XVII.

men, who studied that science in the paths of nature, in the frame and constitution of rational and moral beings, and in the relations by which they are rendered members of one great family under the inspection and government of one common and universal [d] Parent.] It is unquestionably certain, that since this period the dictates of natural law and the duties of Christian morality have been more accurately defined; certain evangelical precepts, whose nature and foundations were but imperfectly comprehended in the times of old, more clearly illustrated; the superiority, which distinguishes the morality of the Gospel from that course of duty that is deducible from the mere light of nature, more fully demonstrated; and those common notions and general principles, which are the foundations of moral obligation, and are, every way, adapted to dispel all doubts that may arise, and all controversies that may be started concerning the nature of evangelical righteousness and virtue, established with greater evidence and certainty. It may also be added, that the impiety of those infidels, who have had the effrontery to maintain, that the precepts of the Gospel are contrary to the dictates of sound reason, repugnant to the constitution of our nature, inconsistent with the interests of civil society, adapted to enervate the mind, and to draw men off from the business, the duties and enjoyments of life, has been much more triumphantly refuted in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, than in any other period of the Christian church.

The state of the
Aristotelian and
Paracelsistic phi-
losophy.

XXX. To these reflexions upon the state of learning and science in general, it may not be improper to add a particular and separate account of the progress and revolutions of philosophy in the Christian schools. At the beginning of this century almost all the European philosophers were divided into two classes, one of which comprehended the *Peripatetics* and the other the *Chemists* or *Fire-philosophers*, as they were often styled. These two classes contended warmly for many years, which should have the pre-eminence, and a great number of laboured and subtle productions were published during the course of this philosophical contest. The *Peripatetics* were in possession of the professorships in almost all the schools of learning, and looked upon all such as presumed, either to reject or even amend the doctrines of ARISTOTLE, as objects of indignation, little less criminal than traitors and rebels. It is however observable, that the greatest part of these supercilious and persecuting doctors, if we except those of the academies of *Tubingen*, *Altorf*, *Juliers*, and *Leipsic*, were less attached to ARISTOTLE himself than to his modern interpreters and commentators. The *Chemists* spread themselves through, almost, all *Europe*, and assumed the obscure and ambiguous title of *Rosacruzian Brethren* [e], which drew, at first, some de-

[(d) This sentence, beginning with *There is scarcely a discourse*, and ending with *Universal Parent*, is added by the translator.]

[e] The title of *Rosacruzians* evidently denotes the *chemical* philosophers, and those who blended the doctrines of religion with the secrets of chemistry. The denomination, itself, is drawn from the science of chemistry, and they only, who are acquainted with the peculiar language of the chemists, can understand its true signification and energy. It is not compounded, as many imagine, of the two words *rosa* and *crux*, which signify *rose* and *cross*, but of the latter of these

gree of respect, as it seemed to be borrowed from the arms of LUTHER, which were a *cross* placed upon a *rose*. They inveighed against the Peripatetics with a singular degree of bitterness and animosity, represented them as corrupters both of religion and philosophy, and published a multitude of treatises against them, which discovered little else than their folly and their malice. At the head of these fanatics were ROBERT FLUDD [f], a native of *England*, and a man of surprizing genius; JACOB BEHMEN, a shoe-maker, who lived at *Gorlitz*; and MICHAEL MAYER [g]. These leaders of the sect were followed by JOHN BAPTIST HELMONT, and his son FRANCIS, CHRISTIAN KNORRIUS DE ROSENROTH, KUHLMAN, NOLLIUS, SPERBER, and many others of various fame. An uniformity of opinion and a spirit of concord seem scarcely possible in such a society as this. For as a great part of its doctrine is derived from certain internal feelings, and certain flights of imagination, which can neither be comprehended nor defined, and is supported by certain testimonies of the external senses, whose reports are equally illusory and changeable; so it is remarkable, that, among the more eminent writers of this sect, there are scarcely any two who adopt the same tenets and sentiments. There are, nevertheless, some common principles, that are generally embraced, and that serve as a center of union to the society. They all maintain, that the dissolution of bodies, by the power of fire, is the only way through which men can arrive at true wisdom, and come to discern the first principles of things. They all acknowledge a certain analogy and harmony between the powers of nature and the doctrines of religion, and believe that the Deity governs *the kingdom of grace* by the same laws, with which he rules the *kingdom of nature*; and hence it is, that they employ chemical denominations to express the truths of religion. They all hold, that there is a sort of

words, and the Latin word *ros*, which signifies *dew*. Of all natural bodies *dew* is the most powerful dissolvent of gold. The *cross*, in the chemical style, is equivalent to *light*, because the figure of the cross $\times$ exhibits, at the same time, the three letters of which the word *lux*, i. e. *light*, is compounded. Now *lux* is called, by this sect, the *seed or menstruum of the red dragon*, or, in other words, that gross and corporeal light, which, when properly digested and modified, produces gold. From all this it follows, that a *Rosicrucian* philosopher is one, who, by the intervention and assistance of the dew, seeks for light, or, in other words, the substance called the *Philosopher's stone*. All other explications of this term are false and chimerical. The interpretations, that are given of it by the chemists, who love, on all occasions, to involve themselves in intricacy and darkness, are invented merely to deceive those who are strangers to their mysteries. The true energy and meaning of this denomination of *Rosicrucians* did not escape the penetration and sagacity of GASSENDI, as appears by his *Examen Philosophiæ Fluddianæ*, § xv. tom. iii. opp. p. 261. It was, however, still more fully explained by RENAUDOT, a famous French Physician, in his *Conferentia Publica*, tom. iv. p. 87. There is a great number of materials and anecdotes relating to the fraternity, rules, observances, and writings of the *Rosicrucians* (who made such a noise in this century) to be found in ARNOLDI's *Kirchen und Ketzer-Historie*, part. II. p. 1114.

[f] See, for an account of this singular man, from whose writings JACOB BEHMEN derived all his mystical and rapturous doctrine, WOOD's *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. i. p. 610. & *Hist. et Antiq. Academiæ Oxoniensis*, lib. ii. p. 390.—For an account of HELMONT, father and son, see HEN. WITTE, *Memor. Philosoph.*—JOACH. FRID. FELLER, in *Miscellan. Leibnitian.*—Several writers, besides ARNOLDI, have given an account of JACOB BEHMEN*.

[g] See MONLERI *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. i. p. 376.

* See, for a further account of JACOB BEHMEN, SECT. II, PART, II, CHAP. I. § XL. of this History.

divine

CENT. XVII. *divine energy* or *soul* diffused through the frame of the universe, which some call *Archæus*, others the *Universal Spirit*, and which others mention under different appellations. They all talk, in the most obscure and superstitious manner, of, what they call, the *signatures of things*, of the power of the stars, over all corporeal beings, and their particular influence upon the human race, of the efficacy of magic, and the various ranks and orders of demons. In fine, they all agree in throwing out the most crude, incomprehensible notions and ideas, in the most obscure, quaint, and unusual expressions.

The philosophy
of Gassendi.

XXXI. This controversy between the *Chemists* and *Peripatetics* was buried in silence and oblivion as soon as a new and more seemly form of philosophy was presented to the world, by two great men, who reflected a lustre upon the French nation, GASSENDI and DES CARTES. The former, whose profound knowledge of mathematics and astronomy was accompanied with the most engaging eloquence, and an acquaintance with all the various branches of solid erudition and polite literature, was canon of *Digne*, and professor of mathematics at *Paris*. The latter, who was a man of quality and bred a soldier, surpassed the greatest part of his contemporaries in acuteness, subtilty, and extent of genius; though he was much inferior to GASSENDI in point of learning. In the year 1624, GASSENDI attacked ARISTOTLE and the whole sect of his commentators and followers with great resolution and ingenuity [b]; but the resentment and indignation which he drew upon himself, from all quarters, by this bold attempt, and the sweetness of his natural temper, which made him an enemy to dissension and contest, engaged him to desist, and to suspend an enterprize that, by opposing the prejudices, was so adapted to inflame the passions of the learned. Hence no more than two books of the work, he had composed against the Aristotelians, were made public; the other five were suppressed [i]. He also wrote against FLUDD, and by refuting him, refuted, at the same time, the *Rosacruzian Brethren*; and here the Aristotelians seemed to behold his labours with a favorable eye. After having overturned several false and visionary systems of philosophy, he began to think of substituting something more solid and satisfactory in their place, and, in pursuance of this design, he proceeded with the utmost circumspection and caution. He recommended to others, and followed himself, that wise method of philosophical investigation, which, with a slow and timorous pace, rises from the objects of sense to the discussions of reason, and arrives at truth by assiduity, experiment, and an attentive observation of the laws of nature; or, to express the same thing in other words, GASSENDI struck out that judicious method, which by an attention to facts, to the changes and motions of the natural world, leads by degrees to general principles, and lays a solid foundation for rational inquiry. In the application of this method he had recourse, chiefly, to mathematical succours, from a persuasion that demonstration and certainty

[b] The title of his book against the Aristotelians is as follows: *Exercitationum paradoxicarum adversus Aristoteleos Libri VII, in quibus præcipua totius Peripateticæ doctrinæ fundamenta excutuntur, opiniones vero, aut novæ aut ex vetustioribus obsoletæ, stabiliuntur.*

[i] See BOUGERELL, *Vie de GASSENDI*, p. 17 & 23.

were the peculiar fruits of that accurate and luminous science. He drew CENT. XVII. no assistance from the science of metaphysics, which he overlooked from an opinion that the greatest part of its rules and decisions were too precarious to satisfy a sincere inquirer, animated with the love of truth [k].

XXXII. DES CARTES followed a very different method in his philosophical researches. He abandoned the mathematics, which he had, at first, looked upon as the tree of knowledge, and employed the science of abstract ideas or metaphysics in the investigation of truth. Having, accordingly, laid down a few plain, general principles, which seemed to be deduced immediately from the nature of man, his first business was to form *distinct notions* of Deity, matter, soul, body, space, the universe and the various parts of which it is composed. From these notions, examined with attention, compared and combined together according to their mutual relations, connexions, and resemblances, and reduced into a kind of system, he proceeded still further, and made admirable use of them in reforming the other branches of philosophy, and giving them a new degree of stability and consistence. This he effected by connecting all his branches of philosophical reasonings in such a manner, that *principles* and *consequences* followed each other in the most accurate order, and that the latter seemed to flow from the former in the most natural manner. This method of pursuing truth could not fail to attract the admiration of many; and so indeed it happened; for no sooner had DES CARTES published his discoveries in philosophy, than a considerable number of eminent men, in different parts of *Europe*, who had long entertained a high disgust against the inelegant and ambiguous jargon of the schools, adopted these discoveries with zeal, declared their approbation of the new system, and expressed their desire that its author should be substituted in the place of the Peripatetics, as a philosophical guide to the youth in the public seminaries of learning. On the other hand, the Peripatetics or Aristotelians, seconded by the influence of the clergy, who apprehended that the cause of religion was aimed at and endangered by these philosophical innovations, made a prodigious noise, and left no means unemployed to prevent the downfall of their old system, and to diminish the growing reputation of the new philosophy. To execute this invidious purpose with the more facility, they not only accused DES CARTES of the most dangerous and pernicious errors, but went so far, in the extravagance of their malignity, as to bring a charge of Atheism against him. This furious zeal of the Aristotelians will not appear so extraordinary when it is considered, that they contended not so much for their philosophical system, as for the honours, advantages, and profits they derived from it. The *Theosophists*, *Rosicrucians*, and *Chemists*, entered into this contest against DES CARTES, but conducted themselves with more moderation than the Aristotelians, notwithstanding their persuasion that the Peripatetic philosophy,

The Cartesian philosophy.

[k] See GASSENDI'S *Institutiones Philosophiæ*, a diffuse production, which takes up the two first volumes of his works, and in which his principal design is to shew, that those opinions, of both the ancient and modern philosophers, which are deduced from metaphysical principles, have little solidity, and are generally defective in point of evidence and perspicuity.

though

CENT. XVII. though chimerical and impious, was much less intolerable than the Cartesian system [1]. The consequences of this dispute were favorable to the progress of science; for the wiser part of the European philosophers, although they did not all adopt the sentiments of DES CARTES, were, nevertheless, encouraged and animated by his example to carry on their inquiries with more freedom from the restraints of tradition and personal authority, than they had formerly done, and to throw resolutely from their necks that yoke of servitude under which ARISTOTLE and his followers had so long kept them in subjection.

Gassendi, the
chief adversary
of Des Cartes.

XXXIII. The most eminent contemporaries of DES CARTES applauded, in general, the efforts he made towards the reformation of philosophy, and that noble resolution with which he broke the shackles of magisterial authority, and struck out new paths in which he proceeded, without a guide, in the search after truth. They also approved of his method of arising, with caution and accuracy, from the most simple and, as it were, the primary dictates of reason and nature, to truths and propositions of a more complex and intricate kind, and of admitting nothing as truth, that was not *clearly* and *distinctly* apprehended as such. They went still further; and unanimously acknowledged, that he had made most valuable and important discoveries in philosophy, and had demonstrated several truths, which, before his time, were received upon no other evidence, than that of tradition and conjecture. But these acknowledgements did not hinder some of those, who made them with the greatest sincerity, from finding several essential defects in the philosophy of this great man. They looked upon his account of the causes and principles of natural things to be, for the most part, hypothetical, founded on fancy, rather than experience. Nay, they attacked the fundamental principles, upon which the whole system of his philosophy was built, such as his ideas of the Deity, of the universe, of matter and spirit, of the laws of motion, and other points that were connected with these. Some of these principles they pronounced uncertain; others of a pernicious tendency, and adapted to engender the most dangerous errors; others, again, directly contrary to the language of experience. At the head of these objectors, was his own fellow-citizen GASSENDI, who, had made war, before him, upon the Aristotelians and Chemists; who, in genius, was his equal; in learning, by much, his superior; and whose mathematical knowledge was most uncommon and extensive. This formidable adversary directed his first attacks against the metaphysical principles, which supported the whole structure of the Cartesian philosophy. He then proceeded still further; and, in the place of the physical system of DES CARTES, substituted one that resembled, not a little, the natural philosophy of EPICURUS, though far superior to it in solidity, much more rational, consistent and perfect, being founded not on the illusory visions of fancy, but on the testimony of sense and the dictates of experience [m]. This new and sagacious observer of nature had not

[1] See BAILLET, *Vie de DES CARTES*.—As also the *General Dictionary*, at the article DES CARTES.

[m] See his *Disquisitio Metaphysica, seu Dubitationes et Instantiæ adversus Cartesii Metaphysicam* et many

many followers, and his disciples were much less numerous than those of DES CARTES. But what he wanted in number was sufficiently compensated by the merit and reputation of those, who adopted his philosophical system; for he was followed by some of the most eminent men in *Europe*, by persons distinguished in the highest degree, by their indefatigable application and their extensive knowledge both of natural philosophy and mathematics. It is also observable, that he had but few disciples in his own country; but among the English, who, in his time, were remarkable for their application to studies of a physical and mathematical kind, a considerable number adopted his philosophical system. Nay, it is remarkable, that even those eminent philosophers and divines, such as WHICHCOT, GALE, CUDWORTH, and MORE, who entered the lists with HOBBS (whose doctrine came nearer to the principles of GASSENDI than to the system of DES CARTES) and revived ancient Platonism in order to crush, under its weight, the philosopher of *Malmesbury*, placed GASSENDI and PLATO in the same class, and explained the sentiments of the latter in such a manner as to make them appear quite agreeable to the principles of the former [n].

XXXIV. From this period must be dated that famous schism, that divided the philosophical world into two great sects, which, though almost agreed concerning those points that are of the greatest utility and importance in human life, differ widely about the principles of human knowledge and the fundamental points from whence the philosopher must proceed in his search of truth. Of these sects the one may be properly called *Metaphysical*, and the other *Mathematical*. The *Metaphysical* sect follows the system of DES CARTES; the *Mathematical* one directs its researches by the principles of GASSENDI. The former looks upon truth as attainable by abstract reasoning; the latter seeks after it by observation and experience. The follower of DES CARTES attributes little to the external senses, and much to meditation and discussion. The disciple of GASSENDI, on the contrary, places little confidence in metaphysical discussion, and has principally recourse to the reports of sense and the contemplation of nature. The former from a small number of abstract truths deduces a long series of propositions in order to arrive at a precise and accurate knowledge of God, and nature, of body and spirit; the latter admits these metaphysical truths, but, at the same time, denies the possibility of erecting, upon their basis, a regular and solid system of philosophy, without the aid of assiduous observation, and repeated experiments, which are the most natural and effectual means of philosophical

Two leading philosophical sects, viz. The Mathematical and Metaphysical.

Responsa, which are published in the third volume of his works, p. 283.—BERNIER, a celebrated French physician, has given an accurate view of the philosophy of GASSENDI, in his Abridgment of it published, in French, at *Lyon*, in the year 1684, in eight volumes in 12^{mo}. This abridgment will give the reader a clearer account of this philosophy, than even the works of GASSENDI himself, in which his meaning is often expressed in an ambiguous manner, and which are, besides, loaded with superfluous erudition. The life of GASSENDI, accurately written by BOUGERELLE, a priest of the oratory, was published at *Paris* in 1737.—See *Biblioth. Française*, tom. xxvii. p. 353.

[n] See the *Preface* to the Latin translation of CUDWORTH's *Intellectual System*; as also the *Remarks* that are added to that translation. [Dr. MOSHEIM is the author of that *Translation* and of these *Remarks*.]

CENT. XVII. progress and improvement. The *one*, eagle-like, soars, with an intrepid flight, to the first fountain of truth, and to the general relations and final causes of things, and descending from thence explains, by them, the various changes and appearances of nature, the attributes and counsels of the Deity, the moral constitution and duties of man, the frame and structure of the universe. The *other*, more difficult and cautious, observes with attention, and examines with assiduity, the objects that are before his eyes, and arises gradually from them to the first cause and the primordial principles of things. The *Cartesians* suppose, that many things are known by man, with the utmost certainty; and hence their propensity to form their opinions and doctrines into a regular system. The followers of GASSENDI consider man, as in a state of ignorance with respect to an immense number of things, and, consequently, think it incumbent upon them to suspend their judgment, in a multitude of cases, until time and experience dispel their darkness; and hence it is also that they consider a *system*, as an attempt of too adventurous a nature, and, by no means, proportioned to the narrow extent of human knowledge, or, at least, they think, that the business of *system-making* ought to be left to the philosophers of future times, who, by joining together the observations and experience of many ages, shall have acquired a more satisfactory and accurate knowledge of nature, than has been yet attained.

These dissensions and contests, concerning the first principles of human knowledge, produced various debates upon other subjects of the utmost moment and importance, such as the *nature of God*, the *essence of matter*, the *elements* or constituent principles of *bodies*, the *laws of motion*, the *manner* in which the divine providence exerts itself *in the government of the world*, the *frame and structure* of the universe, the *nature, union, and joint operations* of *soul and body*. If we consider attentively the profound and intricate nature of these subjects, together with the limits, debility, and imperfections of the human understanding, we shall see too much reason to fear, that these contests will last as long as the present state of man [o]. The wise and the good, sensible of this, will carry on such debates with a spirit of mildness and mutual forbearance, and, knowing that differences in opinions are inevitable, where truth is so difficult of access, will guard against that temerity with which too many disputants accuse their antagonists of irreligion and impiety [p].

[o] VOLTAIRE published, in the year 1740, at *Amsterdam*, a pamphlet entitled, *La Méthaphysique de Newton, ou Parallèle des Sentimens de Newton et de Leibnitz*, which, though superficial and inaccurate, may, nevertheless, be useful to those readers who have not application enough to draw from better sources, and are, nevertheless, desirous to know how much these two philosophical sects differ in their principles and tenets.

[p] It is abundantly known, that DES CARTES and his Metaphysical followers were accused, by many, of striking at the foundations of all religion; nor is this accusation entirely withdrawn even in our times. See in the miscellaneous works of Father HARDOUIN, his *Atheists detected*. Among these pretended Atheists DES CARTES, with his two famous disciples ANTHONY LE GRAND and SILVAN REGIS, hold the first rank; nor is Father MALEBRANCHE, though he seems rather chargeable with fanaticism than atheism, exempted from a place in this odious list. It is true, HARDOUIN, who gives so liberally a place in the atheistical class to these great men, was, himself,

XXXV. All those who had either adopted, without exception, the principles of DES CARTES, or who, without going so far, had approved of the method and rules laid down by him for the investigation of truth, employed all their zeal and industry in correcting, amending, confirming, and illustrating the Metaphysical species of philosophy; and the number of its votaries was prodigious, particularly in *France* and in the United Provinces. But as among the members of this philosophical sect there were some who aimed at the destruction of all religion, more especially SPINOZA, and others, who like BALTHASAR BECKER [q], made use of the principles of DES CARTES, to overturn some doctrines of Christianity, and to pervert others; this circumstance proved disadvantageous to the whole sect, and brought it into disrepute in many places. The Metaphysical philosophy fell, however, afterwards into better hands, and was treated with great wisdom and acuteness by MALEBRANCHE, a man of uncommon eloquence and subtilty; and by LEIBNITZ, whose name is consigned to immortality as one of the greatest geniuses that have appeared in the world [r]. Neither of these great men, indeed, adopted all the principles and doctrines of DES CARTES, but they, both, approved, upon the whole, of his philosophical method, which they enlarged, amended, and improved by several additions and corrections, that rendered its procedure more luminous and sure. This is more especially true of LEIBNITZ, who, rejecting the suggestions of fancy, seemed to follow no other guides than reason and judgment; for MALEBRANCHE, having received from nature a warm and exuberant imagination, was too much

The Metaphysical or Cartesian philosophy improved and propagated with success.

a visionary dreamer, whose judgment, in many cases, is little to be respected; but it is also true, that in the work, now under consideration, he does not reason from his own whimsical notions, but draws all his arguments from those of the followers of ARISTOTLE and GASSENDI, who have opposed, with the greatest success and acuteness, the Cartesian system. Even VOLTAIRE, notwithstanding the moderation with which he expresses himself, seems plainly enough to give his assent to the accusers of DES CARTES. On the other hand, it must be observed, that these accusers are censured, in their turn, by several modern metaphysicians. GASSENDI, for example, is charged by ARNAULD with overturning the doctrine of the soul's immortality in his controversy with DES CARTES, and by LEIBNITZ with corrupting and destroying the whole system of natural religion. See DES MAIZEAUX, *Recueil de diverses pieces sur la Philosophie*, tom. ii. p. 166 *. LEIBNITZ has also ventured to affirm, that SIR ISAAC NEWTON and his followers rob the Deity of some of his most excellent attributes, and sap the foundations of natural religion. In short, the controversial writings, on both sides, are filled with rash and indecent reproaches of this kind.

[(q) See, for a further account of the particular tenets and opinions of BECKER, Sect. II. Part II. Chap. II. § XXXV. of this century.]

[r] For an ample and interesting account of MALEBRANCHE and his philosophy, see FONTENELLE's *Eloges des Academiciens de l'Academie Royale des Sciences*, tom. i. p. 317. and for a view of the errors and defects of his Metaphysical system, see HARDOUIN's *Atheists Unmasked*, in his *Oeuvres Melées*, p. 43.—FONTENELLE has also given an account of the life and philosophical sentiments of LEIBNITZ in the work already quoted, vol. ii. p. 9. but a much more ample one has been published in German by CHARLES GUNTHER LEWIS, in his history of the *Leibnitian Philosophy*. However the genius and philosophy of this great man are best to be learned from his letters to KORTHOLT, published at *Leipsick* in three volumes.

[* If Dr. MOSHEIM refers to the second edition of DES MAIZEAUX *Recueil*, the page is inaccurately quoted; for it is at page 155. of the volume abovementioned, that GASSENDI is censured by LEIBNITZ. It may be further observed, that the censure is not conveyed in such strong terms as those employed by our historian. LEIBNITZ says, that GASSENDI appeared to hesitate and waver too much concerning the nature of the soul, and the principles of natural religion.]

CENT. XVII. ruled by its dictates, and was thus often imperceptibly led into the visionary regions of enthusiasm.

The progress of
the Mathematical
sect.

XXXVI. The Mathematical philosophy, already mentioned, was much less studied and adopted than the Metaphysical system, and its followers in *France* were very few in number. But it met with a favorable reception in *Britain*, whose philosophers perceiving, in its infant and unfinished features, the immortal lines of VERULAM's wisdom, snatched it from its cradle, in a soil where it was ready to perish, cherished it with parental tenderness, and have still continued their zealous efforts to bring it to maturity and perfection. The Royal Society of *London*, which may be considered as the philosophical seminary of the nation, took it under their protection, and have neither spared expence nor pains to cultivate and improve it, and to render it subservient to the purposes of life. It owed, more especially, a great part of its progress and improvement to the countenance, industry, and genius of that immortal protector of science, the pious and venerable Mr. BOYLE, whose memory will be ever precious to the worthy and the wise, the friends of religion, learning, and mankind. The illustrious names of BARROW, WALLIS, and LOCKE, may also be added to the list of those who contributed to the progress of natural knowledge. Nor were the learned divines of the English nation (though that Order has often excited the complaints of philosophers, and been supposed to behold with a zealous and suspicious eye the efforts of philosophy as dangerous to the cause of religion) less zealous than the other patrons of science in this noble cause. On the contrary, they looked upon the improvement of natural knowledge, not only as innocent, but as of the highest utility and importance, as admirably adapted to excite and maintain in the minds of men a profound veneration for the Supreme creator and governor of the world, and to furnish new supports to the cause of religion, and also as agreeable both to the laws and spirit of the Gospel, and to the sentiments of the primitive church. And hence it was, that those doctors, who, in the lectures founded by Mr. BOYLE, attacked the enemies of religion, employed in this noble and pious attempt, the succours of philosophy, with the most happy and triumphant success. But the immortal man, to whose immense genius and indefatigable industry philosophy owed its greatest improvements, and who carried the lamp of knowledge into paths of nature that had been unexplored before his time, was Sir ISAAC NEWTON [s], whose name was revered and his genius ad-

[s] Mr. HUME's account of this great man is extremely just, and contains some peculiar strokes that do honour to this elegant painter of minds. "In NEWTON, says he, this island may boast
"of having produced the greatest and rarest genius, that ever arose for the ornament and instruction of the species. Cautious, in admitting no principles, but such as were founded in
"experiment; but resolute to adopt every such principle, however new and unusual: From modesty ignorant of his superiority above the rest of mankind; and thence, less careful to accommodate his reasonings to common apprehensions: More anxious to merit than acquire fame:
"He was, from these causes, long unknown to the world; but his reputation, at last, broke out
"with a lustre, which scarce any writer, during his own life-time, had ever before attained.
"While NEWTON seemed to draw off the veil from some of the mysteries of nature, he showed,
"at the same time, the imperfections of the mechanical philosophy; and thereby restored her
"ultimate secrets to that obscurity, in which they ever did and ever will remain."

mired, even by his warmest adversaries. This great man spent, with un-
interrupted assiduity, the whole of a long life in correcting, digesting, and
enlarging the new philosophy, and in throwing upon it the light of demon-
stration and evidence both by observing the laws of nature, and by subjecting
them to the rules of calculation; and thus he introduced a great change into
natural science, and brought it to a very high degree of perfection [1].
The English look upon it, as an unquestionable proof of the solidity and
excellence of the Newtonian philosophy, that its most eminent votaries were
friends to religion, and have transmitted to posterity shining examples of
piety and virtue; while, on the contrary, the Cartesian or Metaphysical
system has exhibited, in its followers, many flagrant instances of irreligion,
and some of the most horrid impiety.

XXXVII. The two famous philosophical sects, now mentioned, deprived,
indeed, all the ancient systems of natural science, both of their credit and
their disciples; and hence it might have been expected that they would have
totally engrossed and divided between them the suffrages of the learned.
But this was not the case; the liberty of thinking being restored by
DES CARTES and NEWTON, who broke the fetters of prejudice, in which
philosophical superstition had confined, in former times, the human under-
standing, a variety of sects sprung up. Some trusting in their superior
genius and sagacity, and others, more remarkable for the exuberance of their
fancy, than for the solidity of their judgment, pretended to strike out new
paths in the unknown regions of nature, and new methods of investigating
truth; but the number of their disciples was small, and the duration of their
inventions transitory, and therefore it is sufficient to have barely mentioned
them. There was another sort of men, whom mediocrity of genius, or an
indolent turn of mind indisposed for investigating truth by the exertion of
their own talents and powers, and who terrified, at the view of such an
arduous task, contented themselves with borrowing from the different sects
such of their respective tenets as appeared most remarkable for their perspi-
cuity and solidity, more especially those concerning which all the different
sects were agreed. These they compiled and digested into a system, and
pushed their inquiries no further. The philosophers of this class are gene-
rally termed *Eclectics*. From these remarkable differences of sentiment
and system that reigned among the jarring sects some persons, otherwise
distinguished by their acuteness and sagacity, took occasion to represent
truth as unattainable by such a short-sighted being as man, and to revive
the desperate and uncomfortable doctrine (shall I call it, or jargon) of the
Sceptics, that had long been buried in that silence and oblivion, it so justly

Of the philoso-
phers who adapt
neither of these
systems.

[1] The *Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*, as also the other writings, whether philo-
sophical, mathematical, or theological, of this great man, are abundantly known. There is an
elegant account of his life, and his literary and philosophical merit, given by FONTENELLE, in
his *Eloges des Academiciens de l'Academie Royale des Sciences*, tom. ii. p. 293—323.—See also the
Biblioth. Angloise, tom. xv. part. II. p. 545. and *Biblioth. Raisonnée*, tom. vi. part. II. p. 478.
[See more especially the late learned and ingenious Mr. MACLAURIN's *Account of Sir Isaac
Newton's Discoveries*, &c.]

deserved.

CENT. XVII. deserved. The most eminent of these cloudy philosophers were SANCHES, a physician of *Toulouse* [u], DE LA MOTHE LE VAYER [w], HUET, bishop of *Avranches* [x], to whom we may add, without temerity, the famous BAYLE [y], who, by the erudition and wit that abound in his voluminous works, has acquired such a distinguished reputation in the Republic of Letters.

[u] There is still extant a famous book of this writer, entitled, *De eo, quod nihil scitur*, which, with the rest of his works and an account of his life, was published, in 4^{to} at *Toulouse*, in the year 1636.—See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article SANCHEZ; as also VILLEMANDI *Scepticismus debellatus*, cap. iv. p. 32.

[w] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article VAYER.

[y] Every thing relating to the life and sentiments of BAYLE is abundantly and universally known. His life, composed by DES MAIZEAUX, was published, in the year 1732, at the *Hague*, in two volumes 8^{vo}.—The scepticism of this insidious and seducing writer was unmasked and refuted with great learning and force of argument by the late Mr. CROUSAZ, in a voluminous French work, entitled, *Traité du Pyrrhonisme*, of which Mr. FORMEY has given an elegant and judicious abridgment under the title of, *Triomphe de l'Evidence*.

S E C T I O N II.

P A R T I.

The HISTORY of the more ANCIENT CHURCHES.

C H A P T E R I.

Containing the HISTORY of the ROMISH CHURCH.

I. **H**IPPOLITO ALDOBRANDINI, under the papal name of CLEMENT VIII, CENT. XVII. continued to rule the church of *Rome* at the commencement of this century, having been elected to that high dignity towards the conclusion of the preceding one. The eminent abilities and insidious dexterity of this pontif, as also his ardent desire of extinguishing the protestant religion, and extending the limits of the Romish church, are universally acknowledged; but it is much questioned, whether his prudence was equal to the arduous nature of his station as pontif, and the critical circumstances, of an incidental kind, that arose during his administration [*a*]. He was succeeded, in the year 1605, by LEO XI, of the house of MEDICIS, who died a few weeks after his election; and thus left the papal chair open to CAMILLO BORGHESE, who filled it under the denomination of PAUL V. This pontif was of a haughty and violent spirit, jealous, to excess, of this authority, and insatiably furious in the execution of his vengeance upon such as encroached on his pretended prerogative, as appears, in a striking manner, by his rash and unsuccessful contest with the Venetians [*b*]. GREGORY XV [*c*], who was raised to the pontificate in the year

The popes of
this century.

[*a*] This pontif had an edition of the *Vulgate* published, which was very different from that of Pope SIXTUS; and this is one of the many instances of the *contrariety* of opinions that has prevailed among the *infallible* heads of the church of *Rome*.]

[*b*] This contest arose, partly, from two edicts of the Republic of *Venice* for preventing the unnecessary increase of religious buildings, and the augmentation of the enormous wealth of the clergy; and, partly, from the prosecution of two ecclesiastics, for capital crimes, who had not been delivered up to the pope at his requisition. It is not surprizing, that these proceedings of the Venetians, however just and equitable, should enflame the ambitious fury of a pontif, who called himself *Vice-God, the monarch of Christendom, and the supporter of papal omnipotence*. Accordingly PAUL laid all the dominions of the Republic under an *interdict*, while the Venetians, on the other hand, declared that unjust and tyrannical mandate, null and void, and banished from their territory the Jesuits and Capuchins, who had openly disobeyed the laws of the state. Preparations for war were making, on both sides, when an accommodation, not very honourable to the pope, was brought

1621,

CENT. XVII.

1621, seemed to be of a milder disposition, though he was not less defective than his predecessor in equity and clemency towards those that had separated themselves from the church of *Rome*. The unjust severity against the friends of the Reformation is, indeed, the general and inevitable character of the Roman pontifs; for without this they would be destitute of the predominant and distinctive mark of the papacy. A pope, with sentiments of toleration and charity towards those who refuse a blind submission to his opinions and decisions, is a contradiction in terms. URBAN VIII, whose family-name was MAFFEI BARBERINI, and who, by his interest in the conclave, ascended the papal throne in the year 1623, was a man of letters, an eloquent writer, an elegant poet, and a generous and munificent patron of learning and genius [*d*]; but nothing can equal the rigour and barbarity with which he treated all that bore the name of protestants. He may be, indeed, considered as a good and equitable ruler of the church, when compared with INNOCENT X, of the family of PAMFILI, who succeeded him in the year 1644. This unworthy pontif to a profound ignorance of all those things, which it was necessary for a Christian bishop to know, joined the most shameful indolence and the most notorious profligacy. For he abandoned his person, his dignity, the administration of his temporal affairs, and the government of the church to the disposal of DONNA OLYMPIA [*e*], a woman of corrupt morals, insatiable avarice, and boundless ambition [*f*]. His zealous endeavours to prevent the peace of *Westphalia*, however odious they may appear when considered in themselves, ought not to be reckoned among his personal crimes, since it is to be supposed, that any other pontif,

about by the mediation of HENRY IV of *France*. This controversy, between the pope and the Venetians, produced several important pieces composed by SARPI on the side of the Republic, and by BARONIUS and BELLARMINE in behalf of the pontif. The controversy concerning the nature and limits of the pope's pretended supremacy is judiciously stated, and the papal pretensions accurately examined by SARPI, in his history of this tyrannical *Interdict*, which, in Italian, occupies the fourth volume of his works, and was translated into Latin by Mr. WILLIAM BEDELL of *Cambridge*.—It was PAUL V that dishonoured his title of *Holiness*, and cast an eternal stain upon his *infallibility* by an express approbation of the doctrine of SUAREZ, the Jesuit, in defence of the murder of kings.]

[*(c)* His family name was ALEXANDER LUDOVISIO.]

[*(d)* See LEONI ALLATII *Apes Urbanae*, of which FABRICIUS published a second edition at *Hamburg*. This little work is a sort of *Index* or list of all the learned and eminent men that adorned *Rome* under the pontificate of URBAN VIII, and experienced the munificence and liberality of that pontif; and their number is far from being small. The Latin poems of URBAN, which are not without a considerable portion of wit and elegance, have passed through several editions. [These poems were composed, while he was yet a cardinal. After his elevation to the pontificate he published a remarkable edition of the *Romish Breviary*, and several *Bulls*, among which that, which abolishes the Order of *Female Jesuits* and certain festivals, those relating to image-worship and to the condemnation of JANSENIUS's *Augustinus*, and that which confers the title of *Eminence* upon the cardinal-legates, the three ecclesiastical electors, and the grand master of *Malta*, are the most worthy of notice.]

[*(e)* This DONNA OLYMPIA MALDACHINI was his brother's widow, with whom he had lived, in an illicit commerce, before his elevation to the pontificate, in which his *Holiness* continued afterwards.]

[*(f)* See the *Memoires du Cardinal de Rhetz*, tom. iii. p. 102. tom. iv. p. 12. of the last edition published at *Geneva*.—For an account of the disputes between this pontif and the French, see BOUGEAN *Histoire de la paix de Westphalie*, tom. iv. p. 56.

in

in his place, would have made the same attempts without hesitation or remorse. He was succeeded in the papal chair, in the year 1655, by FABIO CHIGI, who assumed the title of ALEXANDER VII, and who, though less odious than his predecessor, was nevertheless possessed of all the pernicious qualities that are necessary to constitute a true pope, and without which the papal jurisdiction and majesty cannot be maintained. The other parts of his character are drawn, much to his disadvantage, by several ingenious and eminent writers of the Romish church, who represent him as a man of a mean genius, unequal to great or difficult undertakings, full of craft and dissimulation, and chargeable with the most shameful levity and the greatest inconsistency of sentiment and conduct [g]. The two CLEMENTS IX and X, who were elected successively to the papacy in the years 1668 and 1669, were concerned in few transactions, that deserve to be transmitted to posterity [h]. This was not the case of BENEDICT ODESCHALCHI, who is known, in the list of pontifs, by the denomination of INNOCENT XI, and was raised to that high dignity in the year 1677 [i]. This respectable pontif acquired a very high and permanent reputation by the austerity of his morals, his uncommon courage and resolution, his dislike of the grosser superstitions that reigned in the Romish church, his attempts to reform the manners of the clergy, and to abolish a considerable number of those fictions and frauds that dishonour their ministry, and also by other solid and eminent virtues. But it appeared manifestly by his example, that those pontifs who respect truth, and act from virtuous and Christian principles, may, indeed, form noble plans, but will never be able to bring them into execution, or at least to give them that measure of stability and perfection which is the object of their wishes. By his example and administration it appeared, that the wisest institutions and the most judicious establishments will be unable to stand firm, for any considerable time, against the insidious stratagems or declared opposition of a deluded multitude, who are corrupted by the prevalence of licentious morals, whose imaginations are impregnated with superstitious fictions and fables, whose credulity is abused by pious frauds, and whose minds are nourished, or rather amused, with vain rites and senseless ceremonies [k]. Be that as it may, all the wise and salutary regulations

[g] See *Memoires du Cardinal de Rhets*, tom. iv. p. 16. 77.—*Memoires de M. Joly*, tom. ii. p. 186. 210. 237.—ARCKENHOLTZ, *Memoires de la Reine Christine*, tom. ii. p. 125.

[h] CLEMENT IX was of the family of *Rospigliosi*, and the family-name of CLEMENT X was *Altieri*, see *Memoires de la Reine Christine*, tom. ii. p. 126. 131. There are, upon record, several transactions of CLEMENT IX that do him honour, and prove his dislike of nepotism and his love of peace and justice.]

[i] Some maintain, and with the strongest appearance of truth, that this pontif had formerly been a soldier, though this report is treated as groundless by Count TURREZONICO, in his dissertation *De suppositiis militaribus stipendiis Bened. Odescalchi*. See an interesting account of this pontif in BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, at the article INNOCENT XI.]

[k] See *Journal Universal*, tom. i. p. 441. tom. vi. p. 306. The present Pope BENEDICT XIV * attempted, in the year 1743, the canonization of INNOCENT XI; but the king of France, instigated by the Jesuits, has always opposed this design, and that more especially on account of the misunderstandings that always subsisted between LEWIS XIV and INNOCENT, of which more hereafter.

[* This note was written during the life of BENEDICT XIV.]

CENT. XVII. of INNOCENT XI were suffered to go almost to ruin by the criminal indolence of PETER OTTOBONI, who was raised to the head of the Romish church in the year 1689, and assumed the name of ALEXANDER VIII. A laudable attempt was made to revive them by INNOCENT XII, a man of uncommon merit and eminent talents, whose name was PIGNATELLI, and who, in the year 1691, succeeded ALEXANDER in the papal chair; nor were his zealous endeavours absolutely destitute of success. But it was also his fate to learn, by experience, that the most prudent and resolute pontifs are unequal to such an arduous task, such an Herculean labour as the reformation of the church and court of *Rome*; nor were the fruits of this good pope's wise administration enjoyed long after his decease [l]. The pontif, whose reign concluded this century, was JOHN FRANCIS ALBANI, who was raised to the head of the Romish church, in the year 1699, and assumed the name of CLEMENT XI. He surpassed, in learning, the whole college of cardinals, and was inferior to none of the preceding pontifs in sagacity, lenity, and a desire, at least, to govern well; but he was very far from opposing, with a proper degree of vigour and resolution, the inveterate corruptions and superstitious observances of the church over which he presided; on the contrary, he inconsiderately aimed at, what he thought, the honour and advantage of the church (that is, the glory and interest of its pontif) by measures that proved detrimental to both, and thus shewed, in a striking example, that popes, even of the best sort, may fall imperceptibly into the greatest mistakes, and commit the most pernicious blunders through, an imprudent zeal for extending their jurisdiction and augmenting the influence and lustre of their station [m].

The attempts made by the church of *Rome* to oppress the Protestants and ruin their cause.

II. The incredible pains that were taken, by the pontifs and clergy of the Romish church, to spread their doctrine and to erect their dominion among the nations that lay in the darkness of Paganism, have been already mentioned. We are, therefore, at present to confine our narration to the schemes they laid, the cabals they formed, and the commotions they excited, with an uninterrupted and mischievous industry, in order to recover the possessions and prerogatives they had lost in *Europe*, to oppress the Protestants, and to extinguish the light of the glorious Reformation. Various were the stratagems and projects they formed for these purposes. The resources of genius, the force of arms, the seduction of the most alluring promises, the

[l] For an account of the character, morals, and election of INNOCENT XII, see the *Letters* of Cardinal NORIS, published in the fifth volume of his *Works*, p. 362. 365.

[m] In the year 1752, there appeared at *Padua*, a life of CLEMENT XI, composed, in French, by the learned and eloquent Mr. LAFITAU, bishop of *Sisteron*, in two volumes, 8^{vo}. The same year Mr. REBOULET, chancellor of *Avignon*, published in two volumes, in 4^{to}. his *Histoire de Clement XI*. These two productions, and more especially the latter, are written with uncommon elegance; but they both abound with historical errors, which the French writers, in general, are at too little pains to avoid. Besides, they are both composed rather in the strain of panegyric, than of history. An attentive reader will, however, see without pain, even in these panegyrics, that CLEMENT XI, notwithstanding his acknowledged sagacity and prudence, took several rash and inconsiderate steps in order to augment the power and multiply the prerogatives of the Roman pontifs, and thus, through his own temerity, involved himself in various perplexities.

terrors of the most formidable threatnings, the subtle wiles of controversy, the influence of pious, and often of impious frauds, the arts of dissimulation, in short, all possible means, fair and disingenuous, were employed for the destruction of the Reformed churches, but, in most cases, without success. The plan of a dreadful attack upon the friends of the reformation had been, for some time, laid in secret, and the bigoted and persecuting house of *Austria* was pitched upon to put it in execution. However, as injustice is seldom so insolent as not to seek for some pretexts to mask, or, at least, to diminish its deformity, so the church of *Rome* endeavoured before hand to justify the persecution of which the flame was ready to break out. For this purpose the pens of the perfidious and learned SCIOPPIUS [n], of the Jesuits TANNER, POSSEVIN, HAGER, HEDERIC, and FORER, jurists of *Dillingen*, were employed to represent the treaty of peace, made between CHARLES V and the Protestants of *Germany*, as unjust, null, and even rendered void by the protestants themselves, by their departing from, or, at least, perverting by various changes and modifications the confession, of *Augsburg* [o]. This injurious charge was proved groundless by several Lutheran doctors, who, of their own accord, defended their communion against this instance of popish calumny; but it was also refuted by public authority, even by the express order of JOHN GEORGE, elector of *Saxony*. The task was committed to MATTHEW HOE, who, in the years 1628, and 1631, published, in two volumes, an accurate and laborious defence of the Protestants, intitled, *Defensio Pupillæ Evangelicæ*. The mouth of calumny was not stopped by these performances. The accusers continued their clamours, multiplied their libels, and had recourse to the succours of indecent raillery and sarcastical wit to cover, as well as they were able, the striking defects of a bad cause. On the other hand, the Lutheran writers exerted themselves in exposing the sophistry, and refuting the arguments and invectives, of their adversaries.

III. The first flames of that religious war, which the Roman pontiffs proposed to carry on by the arms of the Austrians and Spaniards, their servile and bigoted instruments, broke out in *Austria*, where, about the commencement of this century, the friends of the reformation were cruelly persecuted and oppressed by their Roman-catholic adversaries [p]. The solemn treaties and conventions by which the religious liberty and civil rights of these Protestants had been secured, were trampled upon and violated, in the most

Commutations in
Austria and *Bo-*
hemia.

[(n) SCIOPPIUS seems rather to merit the titles of *malevolent* and *ferocious* than that of *perfidious*, unless his turning papist be considered by Dr. MOSHEIM as an instance of perfidy. This is the intemperate and odious satyrst, who was caned by the servants of the English ambassador at *Madrid*, for the invectives he had thrown out against King JAMES I, in a book which was burnt by the hands of the common hangman at *Paris*.]

[o] See CHRIST. AUG. SALIG, *Histor. August. Confessionis*, tom. i. lib. iv. cap. iii. p. 768.

[p] RAUPACHIUS, in his *Austria Evangelica*, (a German work with a Latin title) has given an accurate account of this persecution and these commotions. The same learned and worthy author had formed the design of publishing an authentic and circumstantial relation of the sufferings of the Protestants in *Stiria*, *Moravia*, and *Carinthia*, with an account of the perfidious snares that were laid for them, the whole drawn from unexceptionable records; but death prevented the execution of this design.

CENT. XVII.

shocking manner; nor had these unhappy sufferers resolution, vigour, or strength sufficient to maintain their privileges. The Bohemians, who were involved in the same vexations, proceeded in a different manner. Perceiving plainly, that the votaries of *Rome* aimed at nothing less than to deprive them of that religious liberty, that had been purchased by the blood of their ancestors, and so lately confirmed to them by an imperial edict, they came to a resolution of opposing force to force, and of taking up arms to defend themselves against a set of men, whom, in consequence of the violence they offered to conscience, they could look upon in no other light than as the enemies of their souls. Accordingly, a league was formed by the Bohemian Protestants, and they began to avenge, with great spirit and resolution, the injuries that had been committed against their persons, their families, their religion, and their civil rights and privileges. But it must be confessed, that, in this just attempt to defend what was dear to them as men and Christians, they lost sight of the dictates of equity and moderation, and carried their resentment beyond the bounds both of reason and religion. Their adversaries were struck with terror at a view of their intrepidity, but they were not dismayed. The Bohemians, therefore, apprehending still further opposition and vexations from bigotry animated by a spirit of vengeance, renewed their efforts to provide for their security. The death of the emperor MATTHIAS, which happened in the year 1619, furnished them, as they thought, a fair opportunity of striking at the root of the evil, and removing the source of their calamities, by choosing a sovereign of the Reformed religion; for they considered themselves as authorized by the ancient laws and customs of the kingdom to reject any that pretended to the throne by virtue of an hereditary right, and to demand a prince, whose title to the crown should be derived from the free suffrages of the states. Accordingly FREDERIC V, elector Palatine, who professed the Reformed religion, was, in the year 1619, chosen king of *Bohemia*, and solemnly crowned at *Prague* [q].

The Bohemian
war:
Frederic V.

IV. This bold step, from which the Bohemians expected such signal advantages, proved to them, a source of complicated misfortunes. Its consequences were fatal to their new sovereign, and to their own liberties and privileges; for by it they were involved in the most dreadful calamities and deprived of the free exercise of the Protestant religion, the security of which was the ultimate end of all the measures they had pursued. FREDERIC was defeated, before *Prague*, by the imperial army, in the year 1620, and by this unfortunate battle was, not only deprived of his new crown, but also of his hereditary dominions. Reduced thus to the wretched condition of an exile, he was obliged to leave his fruitful territories and his ample treasures to the merciless discretion of the Austrians and Bavarians, who plundered and ravaged them with the most rapacious barbarity. The defeat of this unfortunate prince was attended with dreadful consequences to the Bohemians,

[q] Besides CAROLI and JAEGERUS, who have composed the Ecclesiastical History of this century, see BURCH. GOTTH. STRUVII *Syntagma Historiæ Germanicæ*, p. 1487. 1510. 1523. 1538. as also the writers which he recommends. See also the *Histoire de Louis XIII*, composed by the learned and accurate LE VASSOR, tom. iii. p. 223.

and more especially to those, who, from a zeal for religious liberty and the interests of the reformation, had embarked in his cause. Some of them were committed to a perpetual prison, others banished for life; several had their estates and possessions confiscated; many were put to death; and the whole nation was obliged, from that fatal period, to embrace the religion of the victor, and bend their unwilling necks under the yoke of *Rome*. The triumph of the Austrians would neither have been so sudden nor so complete, nor would they have been in a condition to impose such rigorous and despotic terms on the Bohemians, had they not been powerfully assisted by JOHN GEORGE I, elector of *Saxony*, who, partly from a principle of hatred towards the *Reformed* [r], and partly from considerations of a political kind, reinforced, with his troops, the Imperial army [s]. This invasion of the Palatinate was the occasion of that long and bloody war, that was so fatal to *Germany*, and in which the greatest part of the princes of *Europe* were, one way or another, unhappily engaged. It began by a confederacy formed between some German powers and the king of *Denmark*, in order to assert the rights of the elector *Palatine*, unjustly excluded from his dominions, against the despotic proceedings of the emperor. The confederates maintained, that the invasion of *Bohemia*, by this unhappy prince, was no just subject of offence to the emperor; and that the house of *Austria*, whose quarrel the emperor was not obliged by any means to adopt, was alone the sufferer in this case. Be that as it may, the progress and issue of the war were unfavourable to the allies.

V. The success of the imperial arms filled the votaries of popery and *Rome* with the warmest transports of joy and exultation, and presented to their imaginations the most flattering prospects. They thought that the happy period was now approaching, when the whole tribe of heretics, that had withdrawn their necks from the papal yoke, should either perish by the sword, or be reduced under the dominion of the church. The emperor, himself, seemed to have imbibed no small portion of this odious spirit, which was doubly prepared to convert or to destroy. The flame of ambition, that burned within him, was nourished by the suggestions of bigotry. Hence he audaciously carried his arms through a great part of *Germany*,

The progress of
the German or
Bohemian war.

[r] By the *Reformed*, as has been already observed, we are to understand the *Calvinists*, and also, in general, all Protestants that are not of the *Lutheran* persuasion. And here we see a Lutheran elector drawing his sword to support the cause of popery and persecution against a people generously struggling for the Protestant religion, and the rights of conscience.]

[s] See the *Commentarii de Bello Bohemico-Germanico ab A. C. 1617 ad A. 1630*, in 4^{to}.—ABRAHAM SCULTET, *Narratio Apologetica de Curriculo vitæ suæ*, p. 86.—It is well known, that the Roman-catholics, and more especially MARTIN BECAN, a Jesuit, persuaded MATTHEW HOB, who was an Austrian by birth, and the elector's chaplain, to represent to his prince the cause of the elector Palatine (which was the cause of the *Reformed* religion) as, not only unjust, but also as detrimental to the interests of *Lutheranism*, and to recommend to him the cause and interests of the house of *Austria*. See *Unschuldige Nachricht*, A. 1747, p. 858. [What Dr. MOSHEIM observes here may be true. But then it is as true, that MATTHEW HOB must have been a great fool or a great knave to listen to such insinuations, not only on account of their glaring absurdity, but also considering the persons from whom they came. This is the same HOB that is mentioned above as a learned defender of the Lutheran faith.]

suffered

CENT. XVII.

suffered his generals to vex with impunity those princes and states, which refused a blind obedience to the court of *Rome*, and shewed plainly, by all his proceedings, that a scheme had been laid for the extinction of the Germanic liberty, civil and sacred. The elector of *Saxony's* zealous attachment to the emperor, which he had abundantly discovered by his warm and ungenerous opposition to the unfortunate *FREDERIC*, together with the lamentable discord, that reigned among the German princes, persuaded the papal faction that the difficulties, which seemed to oppose the execution of their project, were far from being invincible. Accordingly the persons, concerned in this grand enterprize, began to act their respective parts. In the year 1629, *FERDINAND II*, to give some colour of justice to this religious war, issued out the terrible *restitution-edict*, by which the Protestants were ordered to restore to the church of *Rome* all the possessions, they had become masters of in consequence of the *religious peace*, concluded in the preceding century [t]. This edict was principally owing to the suggestions of the Jesuits. That greedy and ambitious Order claimed a great part of these goods and possessions as a recompence due to their labours in the cause of religion; and hence arose a warm contest between them and the ancient and real proprietors [u]. This contest indeed was decided by the law of force. It was the depopulating soldier, who, sword in hand, gave weight and authority to the imperial edict, wresting out of the hands of the lawful possessor, without form of process, whatever the Romish priests and monks thought proper to claim, and treating the innocent and plundered sufferers with all the severity, that the most barbarous spirit of oppression and injustice could suggest.

Gustavus Adolphus intervenes.

The conclusion of the thirty years war.

VI. *Germany* groaned under these dismal scenes of tumult and oppression, and looked about for succour in vain. The enemy encompassed her on all sides, and none of her princes seemed qualified to stand forth as the avenger of her injuries, or the assertor of her rights. Some were restrained from appearing in her cause by the suggestions of bigotry, others by a principle of fear, and others again by an ungenerous attention to their own private interest, which choked, in their breasts, all concern for the public good. An illustrious hero, whose deeds even envy was obliged to revere, and whose name will descend with glory to the latest ages, came forth, nevertheless, at this critical season; *GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS* took the field, and maintained the cause of the Germanic liberties against the oppression and tyranny of the house of *Austria*. At the earnest request of the French court, which beheld, with uneasiness, the overgrown power of that aspiring house, he set sail for *Germany*, in the year 1629, with a small army; and, by his repeated victories, blasted, in a short time, the sanguine hopes which the pope and emperor had entertained of suppressing the Protestant religion in the empire. These hopes, indeed, seemed to revive in the year 1632, when this glorious assertor

[t] See, for an illustration of this matter, the authors mentioned by *STRUVIUS*, in his *Syntagma Histor. Germanæ*, p. 1553.

[u] See *CHRIST. AUG. SALIG. Historia August. Confessionis*, tom. i. lib. iv. cap. iii. § xxv. p. 810.

of Germanic liberty fell in the battle of *Lutzen* [w]; but this unspeakable loss was, in some measure, made up, in process of time, by the conduct of those who succeeded GUSTAVUS at the head of the Swedish army. And, accordingly, the war was obstinately carried on in bleeding *Germany*, during many years, with various success, until the exhausted treasures of the contending parties, and the pacific inclinations of CHRISTINA, the daughter and successor of GUSTAVUS, put an end to these desolations, and brought on a treaty of peace.

VII. Thus after a war of thirty years, carried on with the most unrelenting animosity and ardour, the wounds of *Germany* were closed, and the drooping states of *Europe* revived, in the year 1648, by the peace of *Westphalia*, so called from the cities of *Munster* and *Osnabrug*, where the negotiations were held, and that famous treaty concluded. The Protestants, indeed, did not derive from this treaty all the privileges they claimed, nor all the advantages they had in view; for the emperor, among other less important instances of obstinacy, absolutely refused to re-instate the Bohemian and Austrian Protestants in their religious privileges, or to restore the *Upper Palatinate* to its ancient and lawful proprietor. But they, nevertheless, obtained by this peace, privileges and advantages, which the votaries of *Rome* beheld with much displeasure and uneasiness; and it is unquestionably evident, that the treaty of *Westphalia* gave a new and remarkable degree of stability to the Lutheran and Reformed churches in *Germany*. By this treaty the peace of *Augsburg*, which the Lutherans had obtained from CHARLES V in the preceding century, was firmly secured against all the machinations and stratagems of the court of *Rome*; by it the *restitution-edict*, which commanded the Protestants to restore to the Romish church the ecclesiastical revenues and lands they had taken possession of after that peace, was abrogated, and both the contending parties confirmed in the perpetual and uninterrupted possession of whatever they had occupied in the beginning of the year 1624. It would be entering into a very long detail, were we to enumerate the advantages that accrued to the Protestant princes from this treaty [x]. All this was a source of vexation to the court of *Rome*, and made its pontif feel the severest pangs of disappointed ambition. He, ac-

The peace of
Westphalia.

[w] See ARCKENHOLTZ, *Memoires de la Reine Christine*, tom. i. p. 7—20. in which there are many very interesting anecdotes relating to the life, exploits, and death of GUSTAVUS. The learned compiler of these *Memoirs* has also thrown much light upon the history of this period, and of the peace that terminated this long and dreadful war.

[x] An account of this whole matter, sufficient to satisfy the curiosity of the most inquisitive reader, may be found in that most elaborate and excellent work compiled by the very learned and judicious JOHN GODFREY DE MEYERN, under the following title: *Acta Pacis Westphalicæ et Executionis ejus Norimbergensis*. See also the more compendious, though valuable work of ADAMI, bishop of *Hierapolis*, entitled, *Relatio Historica de Pacificatione Osnabrugo-Monasteriensis*, of which the illustrious author published a new edition at *Leipsick*, in the year 1737, more accurate and ample than the preceding one. We must not omit here the ingenious Father BOUGEANT's elegant history of this treaty, which, though chiefly drawn from the papers of the French ambassadors, is nevertheless, generally speaking, composed with accuracy, impartiality, and candour; it was published at *Paris*, in the year 1746, in six volumes in 8^{vo}. under the title of *Histoire de la Paix de Westphalie*.

cordingly,

CENT. XVII. cordingly, used various stratagems, without being very scrupulous in the choice, in order to annul this treaty, or elude its effects; but his attempts were unsuccessful, since neither the emperor, nor the princes that had embarked in his cause, thought it adviseable to involve themselves anew in the tumults of war, whose issue is so uncertain, and whose most fatal effects they had lately escaped with so much difficulty. The treaty, therefore, was executed in all its parts, and all the articles, that had been agreed upon at *Munster* and *Osnabrug*, were confirmed and ratified, in the year 1650, at *Nuremberg* [y].

The Protestants
vexed and per-
secuted by *Rome*
and its votaries.

VIII. After this period the court of *Rome* and its creatures were laid under a considerable degree of restraint. They did not any longer dare to make war in an open and public manner upon the Protestants, since the present state of things blasted all the hopes they had fondly entertained of extinguishing the light of the reformation, by destroying, or reducing under their ghostly yoke, the princes and states that had encouraged and protected it in their territories. But wherever they could exert the spirit of persecution with impunity, there they oppressed the Protestants in the most grievous manner, and, in defiance of the most solemn conventions and of the most sacred obligations, encroached upon their rights, privileges, and possessions. Thus in *Hungary*, during the space of ten years [z], both Lutherans and Calvinists were involved in an uninterrupted series of the most cruel calamities and vexations [a]. The injuries and insults they suffered at the hands of many orders of men, and more especially of the Jesuits, both before and after the period now under consideration, are not to be numbered. In *Poland*, all those who ventured to differ from the pope, found, by a bitter experience, during the whole course of this century, that no treaty or convention, that tended to set bounds to the authority or rapacity of the church, was held sacred or even regarded at *Rome*. For many of these were ejected out of their schools, deprived of their churches, robbed of their goods and possessions under a variety of perfidious pretexts, nay, frequently condemned to the most severe and cruel punishments, without having been even chargeable with the appearance of a crime [b]. The remains of the Waldenses, that lived in the vallies of *Piedmont*, were persecuted often with the most inhuman cruelty (and more especially in the years 1632, 1655, and 1685) on account of their magnanimous and steadfast attachment to the religion of their ancestors; this persecution was carried

[y] Pope INNOCENT X opposed to this treaty of peace, in the year 1651, a flaming *Bull*, on which HORNBECK published at *Utrecht*, in 1652, an ample and learned commentary, entitled, *Examen Bullæ Papalis, quâ Innocentius X abrogare nititur pacem Germanicæ*. This *Bull* might perhaps have produced some effect upon the emperor and his allies, had it been properly gilded.

[z] From 1671 to 1681.

[a] See *Historia Diplomatica de statu Religionis Evangelicæ in Hungaria*, p. 69.—PAULI DEBREZENI *Historia Ecclesiæ Reformatæ in Hungaria*, lib. ii. p. 447.—SCHELNORNIUS, in *Museo Helvético*, tom. vii. p. 46—90.

[b] See AD. REGENVOLSCHII *Historia Ecclesiæ Sclavoniæ*, lib. ii. cap. xv. p. 216, 235. 253.—The grievances which the Dissenters from the church of *Rome* suffered in *Poland* after REGENVOLSCHIIUS, may be learned from various *Memorials* that have been published in our times.

on with all the horrors of fire and sword, by the dukes of Savoy [c]. In CENT. XVII. Germany the same spirit of bigotry and persecution produced almost every where flagrant acts of injustice. The infractions of this treaty, and of the Germanic liberty that was founded upon it, would furnish matter for many volumes [d]; and all these infractions were owing to a preposterous and extravagant zeal for augmenting the authority and extending the jurisdiction of the church of Rome. And, indeed, as long as that church and its assuming pontif shall persist in maintaining, that they have a right to extend their lordly scepter over all the churches of the Christian world, so long must those, who have renounced their authority, but are more or less within their reach, despair of enjoying the inestimable blessings of security and peace. They will always be considered as rebellious subjects, against whom the greatest acts of severity and violence are lawful.

IX. The zealous instruments of the court of Rome accomplished at length, in this century, what had often been attempted without success; by delivering Spain from the infidelity of the Moors, and France from the heresy of the Protestants. The posterity of the Moors or Saracens, who had formerly been masters of a great part of Spain, had hitherto lived in that kingdom mixed with the other inhabitants of the country, and their number was still considerable. They were Christians, at least in their external profession and manners, industrious also and inoffensive, and, upon the whole, good and useful subjects; but they were grossly suspected of a secret propensity to the doctrine of MAHOMET, which was the religion of their ancestors. Hence the clergy beset the monarch with their importunate solicitations, and never ceased their clamorous remonstrances before a royal edict was obtained to drive the Saracens, whose numbers were prodigious, out of the Spanish territories. This imprudent step was highly detrimental to the kingdom of Spain, and its pernicious effects are more or less visible even to the present times; but the church, whose interests and dominion are, in popish countries, considered as distinct from the interests and authority of state, and of a much more sublime and excellent nature, acquired new accessions of wealth and power by the expulsion of the Moors [e]. In proportion as the community lost, the church gained; and thus the public good was sacrificed to the demands of bigotry and superstition.

The Moors banished out of Spain, and the Protestants persecuted in France,

In France the persecuting spirit of the church of Rome exhibited scenes still more shocking. The Protestants of that kingdom, commonly called Huguenots, after having groaned, for a long space of time, under various forms of cruelty and oppression, and seen multitudes of their brethren put to death by secret conspiracies or open tyranny and violence, were, at length, obliged either to save themselves by a clandestine flight, or to profess, against

[c] See GILLES, *Histoire Ecclesiastique des Eglises Vaudoises*, published at Geneva in 4^{to} in the year 1656, chap. xlviii. p. 339.

[d] The *Histories* of the grievances, suffered by the Protestants of Germany on account of their religion, that have been composed by STRUVIUS and HOFFMAN, contain ample details of this matter.

[e] See MICHAEL GEDDES's *History of the Expulsion of the Moriscos out of Spain*, in his *Miscellaneous Tracts*, vol. i. p. 59.

CENT. XVII.

The court of
Rome fails in its
attempts upon
England.

their consciences, the Romish religion. This barbarous and iniquitous scene of French persecution, than which the annals of modern history present nothing more unnatural and odious, will find its place below, in the history of the Reformed church [f].

X. All the resources of inventive genius and refined policy, all the efforts of insinuating craft and audacious rebellion, were employed to bring back *Great Britain* and *Ireland* under the yoke of *Rome*. But all these attempts were without effect. About the beginning of this century, a set of desperate and execrable wretches, in whose breasts the suggestions of bigotry and the hatred of the Protestant religion had suppressed all the feelings of justice and humanity, were instigated by three Jesuits, of whom GARNET, the superior of the society in *England*, was the chief, to form the most horrid plot that is known in the annals of history. The design of this conspiracy was nothing less than to destroy, at one blow, JAMES I, the prince of *Wales*, and both houses of parliament, by the explosion of an immense quantity of gun-powder, which was concealed, for that purpose, in the vaults that lay under the house of lords. The sanguinary bigots, concerned in it, imagined, that, as soon as this horrible deed was performed, they would be at full liberty to restore popery to its former credit, and substitute it in the place of the Protestant religion [g]. This odious conspiracy, whose infernal purpose was providentially discovered, when it was ripe for execution, is commonly known in *Britain* under the denomination of the *gun-powder treason* [h].

This discovery did not suspend the efforts and stratagems of the court of *Rome*, which carried on its schemes in the succeeding reign, but with less violence, and more caution. CHARLES I was a prince of a soft and gentle temper, and was entirely directed by the counsels of LAUD, archbishop of *Canterbury*, a man, who was neither destitute of learning nor good qualities [i], though he carried things to excessive lengths through his warm and violent attachment to the ancient rites and ceremonies of the church; the queen, on the other hand, who was a princess of *France*, was warmly devoted to the interests of popery; and from all this it seemed probable enough, that, though treason and violence had failed, yet artifice and mild measures might succeed, and that a reconciliation might be brought about

[f] In the second Chapter of the second Part of this Section.

[g] There is a letter extant, written by Sir EVERARD DIGBY, one of the conspirators, to his wife, after his condemnation, which deserves an eminent place in the history of superstition and bigotry, and shews abundantly their infernal spirit and tendency. The following passage will confirm this judgment: "Now for my intention, says DIGBY, let me tell you, that, if I had thought there had been the least sin in the plot, I would not have been of it for all the world; and no other cause drew me to hazard my fortune and life but zeal to God's religion." See DIGBY's Papers published by secretary COVENTRY.]

[h] See RAPIN THOYRAS, *Histoire d'Angleterre*, livr. xviii. tom. vii. p. 40.—JO. HENR. HEIDEGGERI *Historia Papatus*, Period. § vii. p. 211. 291, &c.

[i] Mr. HUME, speaking of LAUD's learning and morals, expresses himself in the following manner: "This man was virtuous, if severity of manners, alone, and abstinence from pleasure could deserve that name. He was learned, if polemical knowledge could entitle him to that praise." See HUME's *History of Great Britain*, vol. v. p. 193.]

between *England* and *Rome* [k]. This prospect, which had smiled in the imaginations of the friends of popery, vanished entirely when the civil war broke out between the king and parliament. In consequence of these commotions, both the unfortunate CHARLES and his imprudent counsellor LAUD, were brought to the scaffold; and OLIVER CROMWELL, a man of unparalleled resolution, dexterity, and foresight, and a declared enemy to every thing that bore even the most distant resemblance of popery, was placed at the helm of government, under the title of Protector of the commonwealth of *England*.

The hopes of *Rome* and its votaries were, nevertheless, revived by the restoration of CHARLES II., and from that period grew more lively and sanguine from day to day. For that monarch, as appears from unquestionable authorities [l], had been initiated, during his exile, into the mysteries of popery, and had secretly embraced that religion, while his only brother, the presumptive heir to the crown, professed it openly, and had publicly apostatized from the Protestant faith. CHARLES, indeed, was not a proper instrument for the propagation of any theological system. Indolent and voluptuous on the one hand, and inclined to infidelity and irreligion on the other, it was not from him that the Roman pontif could expect that zeal and industry, that were necessary to force upon the English nation a religion so contrary to the tenor of the laws and the spirit of the people as popery was. This zeal was found in his bigoted successor JAMES II.; but it was accompanied with such excessive vehemence and imprudence as entirely defeated its own purposes; for that inconsiderate monarch, by his passionate attachment to the court of *Rome*, and his blind obsequiousness to the unseasonable and precipitate counsels of the Jesuits, who were the oracles of his cabinet, gave a mortal blow to that religion which he meant to promote, and fell from the throne whose prerogatives he was attempting to augment and extend. Immediately on his accession to the crown he openly attempted to restore to its former vigour, both in *England* and *Ireland*, the authority of the Roman pontif, which had been renounced and annulled by the laws of both realms; and that he might accomplish with the more facility this most imprudent purpose, he trampled upon those rights and privileges of his people, that had ever been held most respectable and sacred, and which he had bound himself, by the most solemn engagements, to support and maintain. Justly exasperated and provoked by repeated insults from the throne upon their religion and liberties, and alarmed with natural apprehensions of the approaching ruin of both, the English nation looked about for a deliverer, and fixed its views, in the year 1688, on WILLIAM, prince of *Orange*, son-in-law to their despotic monarch, by whose wisdom and valour things were so conducted, that JAMES was obliged to retire from his dominions and to abdicate

[k] See URBAN CERRI *Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 315.—NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, vol. iii. p. 194.

[l] BURNET'S *History of his own Time*, vol. i. book iii. p. 603. 606.—NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, vol. iv. p. 233. 237. 534.—RAPIN THOYRAS, *Histoire d'Angleterre*, livr. xxiii. vol. ix, p. 160.

CENT. XVII. the crown; and the Roman pontif, with all his adherents, were disappointed in the fond expectations they had formed of restoring popery in *England* [m].

Milder methods
are employed by
Rome against the
Protestant cause.

XI. When the more prudent defenders and patrons of the Romish faith perceived the ill success that attended all their violent and sanguinary attempts to establish its authority, they thought it expedient to have recourse to softer methods; and, instead of conquering the Protestants by open force, proposed deluding them back into the church of *Rome* by the insinuating influence of secret artifice. This way of proceeding was approved by many of the votaries of *Rome*; but they were not all agreed about the particular manner of employing it, and therefore followed different methods. Some had recourse to the appointment of public disputations or conferences between the principal doctors of the contending parties; and this from a notion, which past experience rendered so vain and chimerical, that the adversaries of popery would either be vanquished in the debate, or at least be persuaded to look upon the Roman-catholics with less aversion and disgust. Others declared it as their opinion, that all contest was to be suspended; that the great point was to find out the proper method of reconciling the two churches; and that, in order to promote this salutary purpose, as little stress, as possible, was to be laid upon those matters of controversy that had been hitherto looked upon as of the highest moment and importance. A different manner of proceeding was thought more adviseable by a third set of men, who, from a persuasion that their doctors had more zeal than argument, and were much more eminent for their attachment to the church of *Rome* than for their skill in defending its cause, prepared their combatants with greater care for the field of controversy, taught them a new art of theological war, and furnished them with a new and subtle method of vanquishing, or at least of perplexing, their heretical adversaries.

Theological conferences held between the doctors of both churches.

XII. There was a famous conference held at *Ratisbon*, in the year 1601, at the joint desire of MAXIMILIAN, duke of *Bavaria*, and PHILIP LEWIS, elector *Palatine*, between some eminent Lutheran doctors on the one side, and three celebrated Jesuits on the other. The dispute turned upon the two great points, to which almost all the contests between the Protestants and Roman-catholics are reducible, even the *rule of faith* and the *judge of controversies*. In the year 1615, a conference was held at *Neuburg* between JAMES HEILBRONNER, a learned Lutheran, and JAMES KELLER, a celebrated Jesuit, by the appointment of WOLFGANG WILLIAM, prince *Palatine*, who had a little before that time embraced the Romish faith. But the most famous of all these conferences was that, held in the year 1645 at *Thorn*, by the express order of ULADISLAUS IV, king of *Poland*, between several eminent doctors of the Romish, Lutheran, and Reformed churches. This meeting, which was designed to heal the division that reigned among these churches, and to find out some method of reconciling their differences and

[m] The circumstances of this famous and ever-memorable revolution are accurately recorded by BURNET, in the second volume of his *History of his own Times*; and also by RAPIN, in the tenth volume of his *History of England*. Add to these NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. iv. ch. xi. p. 536.

bringing about their re-union, was thence called the *Charitable Conference*. CENT. XVII. Some time after this, ERNEST Landgrave of *Hesse*, in order to give a plausible colour to his apostasy from the Protestant religion, and make it appear to be the result of examination and conviction, obliged VALERIANUS MAGNUS, a learned Capuchin, to enter the lists with PETER HABERKORN, a reformed minister, in the castle of *Rheinfeldt*. Besides these public conferences, there were others of a more private nature held, during this century, between the doctors of the contending churches. The most remarkable of these was the famous dispute between JOHN CLAUDE, the most learned of the Reformed divines in *France*, and JACQUES BENIGNE DE BOSSUET, whose genius and erudition placed him at the head of the Romish doctors in that country. This dispute, which was held in the year 1685, ended like all the rest. They all widened the breach instead of healing it. Neither of the contending parties could be persuaded to yield; on the contrary, they both returned from the field of controversy more rivetted in their own opinions, and more averse to those of their adversaries [n].

XIII. Those of the Roman-catholics, whose views were turned towards union and concord, did not omit the use of *pious* artifice and stratagem in order to accomplish this salutary purpose. They endeavoured to persuade the zealous Protestants and the rigid Catholics that their differences in opinion were less considerable and less important than they, themselves, imagined; and that the true way to put an end to their dissensions and to promote their union was not to nourish the flames of discord by disputes and conferences, but to see whether their systems might not be reconciled, and their apparent inconsistencies removed, by proper and candid explications. They imagined that an artful exposition of those doctrines of the church of *Rome*, that appeared the most shocking to the Protestants, would tend much to conquer their aversion to popery. Such was the general principle in which the Romish peace-makers agreed, and such the basis on which they proposed to carry on their pacific operations; but they differed so widely in their manner of applying this general principle, and pursued such different methods in the execution of this nice and perilous stratagem, that the event did not answer their expectations. In the way they proceeded, instead of promoting the desired union by their representations of things, their exhortations and counsels, this union seemed to be previously necessary in order to render their explications and exhortations acceptable, nay even supportable; so little were the means proportioned to the end!

The methods of reconciliation employed by the Roman-catholics.

[n] The reader who desires a more particular account of what passed in these conferences, may satisfy his curiosity by consulting the writers mentioned by SAGITTARIUS, in his *Introduet. in Historiam Ecclesiast.* tom. ii. p. 1569. 1581. 1592. 1598. An account of the conference between CLAUDE and BOSSUET was composed and published by each of these famous combatants. BOSSUET's account was thus entitled: *Conference avec M. CLAUDE sur la matiere de l'Eglise*, Paris 1683, in 12^{mo}. This account was answered by CLAUDE, in his *Reponse au Livre de M. DE MEAUX intitulé Conference avec M. CLAUDE*, published at the Hague in 8^{vo}. in the year 1683.

CENT. XVII.

The first and most eminent of those who tried the force of their genius in this arduous enterprize was Cardinal RICHELIEU, that great minister, who employed all the influence of promises and threatenings, all the powers of sophistry and eloquence, all the arts of persuasion, in order to bring back the French Protestants into the bosom of the Romish church [o]. The example of this illustrious prelate was followed, but with less dignity and less influence, by MASENIUS, a German Jesuit [p], VOLUSIUS, a theologist of Mentz [q], PRÆTORIUS, a Prussian [r], GIBBON DE BURG, an Irish doctor, who was professor at *Erfurth* [s], MARCELLUS, a Jesuit [t], and other divines of inferior note. But of all modern adepts in controversy none pursued this method with such dexterity and art as BOSSUET, bishop of *Meaux*, a man of true genius, directed by the most consummate circumspection and prudence. The famous *Exposition of the Roman-catholic Faith*, that was drawn up by this subtle and insinuating author, was designed to shew the Protestants that their reasons against returning to the bosom of the Romish church would be soon and easily removed, provided they would view the doctrines of that church in their true light, and not as they had been erroneously represented by the Protestant writers [u]. This notion was propagated, though with less dexterity and success, by DEZIUS, a Jesuit of

[o] RICH. SIMON, *Lettres Choïses*, tom. i. p. 31, 32. new edit.—BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article AMYRAUT, note i; at the article BEAULIEU, note c; at the article FERRY, note d; at the article MILLETIERE.

[p] See FRID. SPANHEMII *Stricturæ ad BOSSUETI Expositionem Fidei Catholicæ*, tom. iii. opp. *Theolog.* part. II. p. 1042.

[q] There is extant a book composed by this writer under the following title: *Aurora pacis religiosæ divinæ veritati amica*. Mogunt. 1665, in 4^{to}.

[r] In his *Tuba pacis*, of which the reader may see a curious account in BAYLE's *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for the year 1685, p. 1309.

[s] In a treatise, entitled, *Luthero-Calvinismus schismaticus quidem, sed reconciliabilis*.

[t] The book of MARCELLUS, entitled, *Sapientia Pacifica*, was refuted by SELDIUS at the express desire of the duke of Saxe-Gotha.

[u] This book might furnish subject for a multitude of reflexions. See a particular account of its history and its effects in PFAFF's *Historia Litteraria Theologiæ*, tom. ii. p. 102. and LE CLERC's *Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique*, tom. xi. p. 438. [It is remarkable, that nine years passed before this book could obtain the pope's approbation. CLEMENT X refused it positively. Nay, several Roman-catholic priests were rigorously treated and severely persecuted for preaching the doctrine contained in the exposition of BOSSUET, which was, moreover, formally condemned by the university of *Louvain*. The Sorbonne also disavowed the doctrine contained in that book; though by a late edict we learn, that the fathers of that theological seminary have changed their opinion on that head, and thus given a new instance of the variations that reign in the Romish church, which boasts so much of its uniformity in doctrinal matters. The artifice that was employed in the composition of this book, and the tricks that were used in the suppression and alteration of the first edition that was given of it, have been detected with great sagacity and evidence by the learned and excellent Archbishop WAKE, in the *Introduction* to his *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, &c.* See also his two *Defences* of that *Exposition*, in which the perfidious sophistry of BOSSUET is unmasked and refuted in the most satisfactory manner. There was an excellent answer to BOSSUET's book published by M. DE LA BASTIDE, one of the most eminent Protestant ministers in France. This answer the French prelate took no notice of, during eight years, at the end of which he published an advertisement, in a new edition of his *Exposition*, which was designed to remove the objections of LA BASTIDE. The latter replied in such a demonstrative and victorious manner, that the learned bishop, notwithstanding all his eloquence and art, was obliged to quit the field of controversy.]

Straßburg,

Straßburg, who wrote a book expressly to prove that there was little or no difference between the doctrine of the council of *Trent*, and that of the confession of *Augsburg*, than which no two systems can be more irreconcilably opposite [w]. It is however remarkable, that all these pacific attempts to re-unite the two churches were made, by the persons now mentioned, on their own private authority; they were not avowed by the higher powers, who, alone, were qualified to remove, modify, or explain away those doctrines and rites of the Romish church that shocked the Protestants and justified their separation. It is true, indeed, that, in the year 1686, this plan of reconciliation was warmly recommended by a person properly commissioned, or, at least, who gave himself out for such. This pacificator was CHRISTOPHER DE ROHAS, bishop of *Tinia*, in the district of *Bosnia*; who, during several years, frequented, with these reconciling views, the courts of the Protestant princes in *Germany*; intimated the assembling of a new council, that was to be more impartial in its decisions and less restrained in its proceedings than the council of *Trent*; nay, went still further, and assured the Protestants, that they should obtain without difficulty whatever rights, privileges, and immunities they should think proper to demand from the Roman pontif, provided they would acknowledge his paternal authority, and no longer refuse a profound submission to his mild and gentle empire. But the artifice and designs of this specious missionary were easily detected; the Protestant doctors and also their sovereigns soon perceived, that a fair and candid plan of reconcialition and union was not what the court of *Rome* had in view; but that a scheme was laid of restoring its pontiffs to their former despotic dominion over the Christian world [x].

XIV. The Romish peace-makers found among the Protestants, and more especially among those of the *Reformed* church, certain doctors, who, by a natural propensity to union and concord, seconded perhaps, in some, by views of interest or by the suggestions of ambition, were disposed to enter into their plan, and to assist them in the execution of it. These doctors maintained, that the points in debate between the two churches were not of sufficient importance to justify their separation. Among the French Protestants LEWIS LE BLANC and his disciples were suspected of an inclination to go too great lengths in this matter [y]. The same accusation was brought, with fuller evidence, against HUISSEAUX, professor of divinity at *Saumur*, MILLETIER, LE FEVRE, and others of less note [z]. Among the British

Protestant peace-makers.

[w] This book is entitled, *La Ré-union des Protestans de Straßburg à l'Eglise Romaine*, published in 8° at *Straßburg* in the year 1689.—See PHIL. JAC. SPENERI *Confilia Theol. German.* tom. 1. p. 95.

[x] See Jo. WOLF JAEGERI *Historia Ecclesiast. Saeculi xvii.*—CHRIST. EBERHARD WEIS-MANNI *Hist. Ecclesiast. Saeculi xvii.* p. 735. The reader will find, in the *Commercium Epistolicum Leibnitianum* of GRUBERUS*, an account of the particular conditions of reconciliation, that were proposed, in the year 1660, to the German courts by the elector of *Mentz*, authorised, as it is alleged, by the Roman pontif.

[y] See a particular and interesting account of LE BLANC in BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article *BLANC*.

[z] See the abovementioned *Dictionary*, at the article *MILLETIERE*. For an account of HUIS-

* Tom. i. p. 411. 415. 426.

CENT. XVII. divines this excessive propensity to diminish the shocking absurdities of popery was less remarkable; WILLIAM FORBES was the principal person who discovered an extreme facility to compose a considerable number of the differences that contributed to perpetuate the separation between the two churches [a]. With respect to the Dutch it is abundantly known, how ardently the great and learned GROTIUS desired the re-union of all Christian churches in one general bond of charity and concord, and with what peculiar zeal he endeavoured to reform some enormities of the church of *Rome*, and to excuse others. But these and all the other arbitrators, whose names and whose efforts in this pacific cause it would be tedious to mention, derived no other fruit from their, perhaps, well-intended labours, than the displeasure of both the contending parties, and the bitter reproaches of their respective churches.

In the number of the Protestant doctors, who discovered an inconsiderate zeal for the re-union of these churches, many writers place GEORGE CALIXTUS, a man of eminent learning, and professor of divinity in the university of *Helmstadt*. It is nevertheless certain, that this great man discovered and exposed the errors and corruptions of popery with a degree of learning and perspicuity that was scarcely surpassed by any writer of this century, and persisted stedfastly in maintaining that the decrees and anathemas of the council of *Trent* had banished all hopes of a reconciliation between the Protestant churches and the see of *Rome*. It is true, indeed, that CALIXTUS looked upon some of the controversies, that divided the two communions, with much more moderation and indulgence than was usual, and decided them in a manner that did not seem suited to the taste and spirit of the times; he was also of opinion, that the church of *Rome* had not destroyed the genuine principles of Christianity, but had only deformed them with its senseless fictions, and buried them under a heap of rubbish, under a motley multitude of the most extravagant and intolerable doctrines and ceremonies. It was undoubtedly on this account, that he has been ranked by some in the class of the imprudent peace-makers already mentioned.

SEAUX, and his pacific counsels, see RICH. SIMON *Lettres Choieses*, tom. iii. p. 14.—AYMON, *Synodes Nationnaux des Eglises Reformees en France*, tom. ii. p. 765.—The labours of LE FEVRE, father to the famous Madame DACIER, in the same cause are mentioned by MORHOFIUS, in his *Polyhistor*, tom. i. p. 295.

[a] See FORBES'S *Considerationes modestæ et pacificæ controversarum de justificatione, purgatorio, &c.* which were published in 8^{vo} at London, in the year 1658, and afterwards, more correctly, in Germany, under the inspection of JOHN FABRICIUS, professor of divinity at *Helmstadt*. FORBES is mentioned by GRABE with the highest encomiums, in his *Notæ ad Bulli Harmoniam Apostolicam*, p. 19. and if we consider his probity, and the exemplary regularity of his life and conversation, he must be allowed to deserve the praise that is due to piety and good morals. Nevertheless, he had his infirmities; and the wiser part of the English doctors acknowledge, that his propensity towards a reconciliation with the church of *Rome* was carried too far. See BURNET'S *History of his own Time*, vol. i. p. 21.—On this account he has been lavishly praised by the Roman-catholic writers; see R. SIMON *Lettres Choieses*, tom. iii. lett. xviii. p. 119.—He was, undoubtedly, one of those, who contributed most to spread among the English a notion (whose truth or falshood we shall not here examine) that King CHARLES I and Archbishop LAUD had formed the design of restoring popery in England.

XV. It was no difficult matter to defeat the purposes and ruin the credit of these pacific arbitrators, who, upon the whole, made up but a motley and ill-composed society, weakened by intestine discords. It required more dexterity and greater efforts of genius to oppose the progress and disconcert the sophistry of a set of men, who had invented new methods of defending popery and attacking its adversaries. This new species of Polemic doctors were called *Methodists*, and the most eminent of them arose in *France*, where a perpetual scene of controversy, carried on with the most learned among the *Huguenots*, had augmented the dexterity and improved the theological talents of the Roman-catholic disputants. The *Methodists*, from their different manner of treating the controversy in question, may be divided into two classes. In the one we may place those doctors whose method of disputing with the Protestants was disingenuous and unreasonable, and who followed the examples of those military chiefs, who shut up their troops in entrenchments and strong holds in order to cover them from the attacks of the enemy. Such was the manner of proceeding of the Jesuit VERON, who was of opinion that the Protestants should be obliged to prove the tenets of their church [b] by plain passages of scripture, without being allowed the liberty of illustrating these passages, reasoning upon them, or drawing any conclusions from them [c]. In the same class may be ranked NIHUSIUS, an apostate from the Protestant religion [d], the two WALENBURGS, and other Polemics, who, looking upon it as an easier matter to maintain their pretensions, than to shew upon what principles they were originally founded [e], obliged their adversaries to prove all their assertions and objections, whether of an affirmative or negative kind, and confined themselves to the easier business of answering objections and repelling attacks. We may also place among this kind of Methodists Cardinal RICHELIEU, who judged it the shortest and best way to attend little to the multitude of accusations, objections, and reproaches with which the Protestants loaded all the various branches of the Romish government, discipline, doctrine, and worship, and to confine the whole controversy to the single article of the *divine institution* and *authority* of the CHURCH, which he thought it essential to establish by

The popish Methodists.

[(b) More especially the doctrines that peculiarly oppose the decrees and tenets of the council of Trent.]

[c] MUSÆUS, *De usu principiorum Rationis in Controversiis Theologicis*, lib. i. ch. iv. p. 22.—G. CALIXTI *Digressio de Arte Nova*, p. 125.—SIMON *Lettres Choies*, tom. i. p. 276.

[d] See a particular account of this vain and superficial doctor in BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, at the article NIHUSIUS. His work, entitled, *Ars Nova dicto Sacrae Scripturae unico lucrandi e Pontificiis plurimos in partes Lutheranorum detecta*, &c. was refuted in the most satisfactory manner by CALIXTUS, in his *Digression in Arte Nova contra NIHUSIUM*, a curious and learned work which was published * in 4^{to} at Helmstadt, in 1634.

[(e) That is to say, in other words, that they pleaded *prescription* in favour of popery, and acted like one, who having been, for a long time, in possession of an estate, refuses to produce his title, and requires that those, who question it, should prove its insufficiency or falshood.]

* This piece originally made a part of the *Theologia Moralis* of CALIXTUS, but was afterwards published separately.

CENT. XVII. the strongest arguments, as the grand principle, that would render popery impregnable [f].

The *Methodists* of the second class were of opinion, that the most expedient manner of reducing the Protestants to silence was not to attack them by piecemeal, but to overwhelm them, at once, by the weight of some general principle, or presumption, some universal argument, which comprehended, or might be applied to, all the points contested between the two churches. They imitated the conduct of those military leaders, who, instead of spending their time and strength in sieges and skirmishes, endeavour to put an end to the war by a general and decisive action. This method, if not invented [g], was, at least, improved and seconded by all the aids of eloquence and genius by NICOLLE, a celebrated doctor among the Jansenists [h], and it was followed by many of the disputants of the church of Rome, who were so fully persuaded of its irresistible influence, that they looked upon any one of the general points, already mentioned, as sufficient, when properly handled, to overturn the whole protestant cause. Hence was it, that some of these Polemics rested the defence of popery upon the single principle of *prescription*; others upon the vicious lives of several of those princes, who had withdrawn their dominions from the yoke of Rome; others, again, upon the criminal nature of religious *schism*, with which they reproached the promoters of the reformation; and they were all convinced, that, by urging their respective arguments and making good their respective charges, the mouths of their adversaries must be stopped, and the cause of Rome and its pontif triumph [i]. The famous BOSSUET stood foremost in this class, which he peculiarly adorned by the superiority of his genius and the insinuating charms of his eloquence. His arguments, indeed, were

[f] For a more ample account of these methods of controversy, and of others used by the church of Rome, the curious reader may consult FRID. SPANHEM. *Strictur. ad Expositionem fidei Bossueti*, tom. iii. opp. part. II. p. 1037.—JO. HENR. HEIDEGGER *Histor. Papatus*, Period. vii. § ccxviii. p. 316.—WALCHII *Introduct. ad Controvers. Theolog.* tom. ii.—WEISMANNI *Histor. Ecclesiastica*, Sæc. xvii. p. 726.

[(g)] This method certainly was not the invention of NICOLLE, for it seems to differ little, if at all, from the method of Cardinal RICHELIEU. We may observe further, that RICHELIEU seems rather to belong to the second class of Methodists, than to the first, where Dr. MOSHEIM has placed him.]

[h] NICOLLE is supposed to be the author of a book, entitled, *Préjuges légitimes contre les Calvinistes*, which was first published at Paris in 1671, passed, afterwards, through several editions, and was answered in a satisfactory manner by several learned men. [It is very remarkable, that some of the principal arguments, employed in this book against the Protestants, are precisely the same that the Deists make use of to shew that it is impossible for the general body of Christians to believe upon a rational foundation. The learned CLAUDE, in his *Defence of the Reformation*, shewed, in a demonstrative manner, that the difficulties arising from the incapacity of the multitude to examine the grounds and principles of the Protestant religion, are much less than those which occur to a papist, whose faith is founded, not on the plain word of God alone, but on the dictates of tradition, on the decrees of councils, and a variety of antiquated records that are beyond his reach. The protestant divine goes still further, and proves that there are arguments in favour of Christianity and the Protestant faith, that are intelligible by the lowest capacity, and, at the same time, sufficient to satisfy an upright and unprejudiced mind.]

[i] FRID. SPANHEMII *Diff. de Prescriptione in rebus fidei adversus novos Methodistas*, tom. iii. part. II. opp. p. 1079.

more specious than solid, and the circumstances, from which they were drawn, were imprudently chosen. From the variety of opinions, that take place among the protestant doctors, and the changes that have happened in their discipline and doctrine, he endeavoured to demonstrate that the church, founded by LUTHER, was not the true church; and on the other hand, from the perpetual sameness and uniformity that reign in the tenets and worship of the church of *Rome*, he pretended to prove its divine original [k]. Such an argument must indeed surprize, coming from a man of learning, who could not be ignorant of the temporising spirit of the Roman pontif, nor of the changes they had permitted in their discipline and doctrine, according to the genius of time and place, and the different characters of those whom they were desirous to gain over to their interests. It was still more surprizing in a French prelate, since the doctors of that nation generally maintain, that the leaden age does not differ more from the age of gold, than the modern church of *Rome* differs from the ancient and primitive church of that famous city.

XVI. These various attempts of the votaries of *Rome*, though they gave abundant exercise to the activity and vigilance of the Protestant doctors, were not, however, attended with any important revolutions, or any considerable fruits. Some princes, indeed, and a few learned men were, thereby, seduced into the communion of that church, from whose superstition and tyranny their ancestors had delivered themselves and others; but these defections were only personal, nor was there any people or province either inclined or engaged to follow these examples. Among the more illustrious deserters of the Protestant religion were CHRISTINA, queen of *Sweden* [l], a princess of great spirit and genius, but precipitate and vehement in almost all her proceedings, and preferring her ease, pleasure, and liberty to all other considerations [m]; WOLFGANG WILLIAM, count *Palatine* of the *Rhine*;

Deserters from
the Protestant to
the Romish
church.

[k] This is the purpose of BOSSUET's *Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes*, which was published in 8^{vo} at *Paris*, in the year 1688, and is still considered, by the Roman-catholics, as one of the strongest bulwarks of popery. Let them go on in their illusions, and boast of this famous champion and defender; but, if they have any true zeal for the cause he defends, or any regard for the authority of the supreme head of *their* church, they will do well to bury in oblivion that maxim of this *their* champion, that *the church, which frequently modifies, varies, and changes its doctrines, is destitute of the direction of the Holy Spirit.* [This observation of Dr. MOSHEIM's might be verified by numberless instances of variations in the doctrine and worship of *Rome*, that must strike every one, who has any tolerable acquaintance with the history of that church. But, without going any further than one single instance, we may observe, that BOSSUET had a striking proof of the variations of his own church, in the different reception that his *Exposition of the Roman-catholic faith* met with from different persons, and at different times. It was disapproved of by one pope, approved of by another; it was applauded by the archbishop of *Rheims*, and condemned by the university of *Louvain*; it was censured by the Sorbonne in the year 1671, and declared by the same society a true exposition of the Catholic faith in the following century. For a full proof of the truth of these and other variations, see WAKE's *Exposition*, &c.—*Le Clerc Bibl. Univ.* tom. xi. p. 438, &c.—*General Dictionary*, at the article WAKE, in the note, and *Biblioth. des Sciences*, &c. tom. xviii. p. 29, &c.]

[l] See ARCKENHOLK, *Memoires de la Reine CHRISTINE*, which contain a variety of agreeable and interesting anecdotes.

[m] The candid and impartial writer, mentioned in the preceding note, has given an ample account of the circumstances that attended this queen's change of religion, and of the causes that

CENT. XVII. CHRISTIAN WILLIAM, marquis of Brandenburg; ERNEST, prince of Hesse [n]; JOHN FREDERICK, duke of Brunswick; and FREDERICK AUGUSTUS, king of Poland:

The learned men, that embraced the communion of the church of Rome, were Baron BOINEBURG, secretary to the elector of Mentz, and an eminent patron of erudition and genius [o], CHRISTOPHER RANZOW, a knight of Holstein [p], CASPAR SCIOPPIUS, PETRUS BERTIUS, CHRISTOPHER BESOLD, ULRIC HUNNIUS, NICHOLAS STENON, a Danish physician, of great reputation in his profession, JOHN PHILIP PFEIFFER, professor at Königsburg, LUCAS HOLSTENIUS, PETRUS LAMBECIUS, HENRY BLUMIUS, professor at Helmstadt, a man of learning and of excessive vanity [q], DANIEL NESSELIUS, ANDREW FROMMIUS, BARTHOLD NIHUSIUS, CHRISTOPHER HELLWIGIUS, MATTHEW PRÆTORIUS, and a few others of inferior rank in the learned world. But these conversions, when considered with the motives that produced them, will be found, in reality, less honourable to the church of Rome than they are, in appearance; for if in the list of princes and learned men abovementioned, we efface those, whom the temptations of adversity, the impulse of avarice and ambition, the suggestions of levity, the effects of personal attachments, the power of superstition upon a feeble and irresolute mind, and other motives of like merit, engaged to embrace the Romish religion, these proselytes will be reduced to a number too small to excite the envy of the Protestant churches [r].

might have contributed to determine her to a step so unexpected and inexcusable. It was neither the subtilty of DES CARTES, nor the dexterity of CANUT, that brought about this event, as BAILLET would persuade us. The true state of the case seems to have been this; CHRISTINA, having had her sentiments of religion in general considerably perverted by the licentious insinuations of her favourite BOURDELOT, was by that means prepared for embracing any particular religion, that pleasure, interest, or ambition should recommend to her. Upon this foundation the Jesuits MACEDO, MALINES, and CASSATI, under the immediate protection of PIMENTEL, and encouraged by the courts of Rome, Spain, and Portugal, employed their labours and dexterity in the conversion of this princess, whose passion for Italy, together with that taste for the fine arts and the precious remains of antiquity that made her desirous of sojourning there, may have contributed not a little to make her embrace the religion of that country.]

[n] This learned and well-meaning prince was engaged by the conversation and importunities of VALERIUS MAGNUS, a celebrated monk of the Capuchin Order, to embrace popery in the year 1651. see GRUBERI *Commercium Epistol. Leibnitianum*, tom. i. p. 27. 35.—*Memoires de la Reine CHRISTINE*, tom. i. p. 216.—It is however to be observed, that this prince, together with ANTHONY ULRIC, duke of Brunswick, and several others, who went over to the church of Rome, did not go over to *that* church of Rome which is now exhibited to us in the odious forms of superstition and tyranny, but to another kind of church, which perhaps never existed, but in their idea, and which, at least, has long ceased to exist. That this was the case appears evidently from the theological writings of Prince ERNEST.

[o] This eminent man, who had more learning than philosophy, and was more remarkable for the extent of his memory than for the rectitude of his judgment, followed the example of the prince of Hesse in the year 1653. See GRUBERI *Commercium Epistol. Leibnitianum*, in which his Letters and those of CONRINGIUS are published, tom. i. p. 35. 37. 39. 48. 56. 60. 70. 76. 93. &c.

[p] See MOLLERI *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. i. p. 520.

[q] BLUMIUS deserted from the Protestant church in the year 1654.—See BURCKARDI *Historia Biblioth. Augustæ*, part. III. p. 223. 233.—GRUBERI *Commercium Epistol. Leibnitianum*, tom. i. p. 41. 95. 135. 137. 379. 388. 410. In these Letters he is called *Florus*, probably in allusion to his German name *Blum*, which signifies a flower.

[r] See, for a particular account of these proselytes to popery, WEISMAN'S *Historia Eccl.*

XVII. The Christian churches in the East, which were independent on the yoke of *Rome*, did not stand less firm and steadfast against the attempts of the papal missionaries, than those of *Europe*. The pompous accounts, which several Roman-catholic writers have given of the wonderful success of these missionaries among the *Nestorians* and *Monophysites*, are little else than splendid fables designed to amuse and dazzle the multitude; and many of the wisest and best of the Roman-catholic doctors acknowledge, that they ought to be considered in no other light. As little credit is to be given to those, who mention the strong propensity discovered by several of the heads and superintendants of the Christian sects in these remote regions, to submit to the jurisdiction of the Roman pontif [s]. It is evident, on the contrary, that *Rome*, in two remarkable instances, suffered a considerable diminution of its influence and authority in the eastern world during this century. One of these instances was the dreadful revolution in *Japan*, which has been already related, and which was unhappily followed by the total extinction of Christianity in that great monarchy. The other was the downfall of popery by the extirpation of its missionaries in the empire of *Abyssinia*, of which it will not be improper, or foreign from our purpose, to give here a brief account.

The Romish church interest loses ground in the East.

About the commencement of the seventeenth century, the Portuguese Jesuits renewed, under the most auspicious encouragement, the mission to *Abyssinia* that had been, for some time before that period, interrupted and suspended. For the Emperor *SUSNEIUS*, who assumed the denomination of *SELTAM SEGUED*, after the defeat of his enemies and his accession to the crown, covered the missionaries with his peculiar protection. Gained over to their cause, partly by the eloquence of the Jesuits, and partly by the hopes of maintaining himself upon the throne by the succours of the Portuguese, he committed the whole government of the church to *ALPHONSO MENDES*, a missionary from that nation, created him patriarch of the Abyssinians, and not only swore in a public manner allegiance to the Roman pontif in the year 1626, but moreover obliged his subjects to abandon the religious rites and tenets of their ancestors, and to embrace the doctrine and worship of the Romish church. But the new patriarch ruined, by his intemperate zeal, imprudence, and arrogance, the cause in which he had embarked, and occasioned the total subversion of the Roman pontif's authority and jurisdiction, which had really been established upon solid foundations. For he began his ministry with the most inconsiderate acts of violence and despotism. Following the spirit of the Spanish *inquisition*, he employed formidable

Sæc. xvii. p. 738.—*WALIKIUS'S Introductio in Controversias*, tom. ii. p. 728.—*ARNOLD'S Kirchen-und Ketzer-Historie*, part. II. p. 912. and other writers of civil and literary history.

[s] See the remarks made by *CHARDIN* in several places of the last edition of his *Travels*. See also what *URBAN CERRI*, in his *Present State of the Church of Rome*, says of the *Armenians* and *Coptes*.—It is true, indeed, that among these sects the papal missionaries, sometimes, form congregations, that are obedient to the see of Rome; but these congregations are poor and inconsiderable, and composed only of a handful of members. Thus the *Capuchins*, about the middle of the century now under consideration, founded a small congregation among the *Monophysites* of *Asia*, whose bishop resides at *Aleppo*. See *LEQUIEN, Oriens Christianus*, tom. ii. p. 1408.

threatenings

CENT. XVII. threatenings and cruel tortures to convert the Abyssinians, the greatest part of whom, together with their priests and ministers, held the religion of their ancestors in the highest veneration, and were willing to part with their lives and fortunes rather than forsake it. He also ordered those to be re-baptized, who, in compliance with the orders of the emperor, had embraced the faith of *Rome*, as if their former religion had been nothing more than a system of paganism [t]. This the Abyssinian clergy looked upon as a shocking insult upon the religious discipline of their ancestors, and as even more provoking than the violence and barbarities practised against those who refused to submit to the papal yoke. Nor did the insolent patriarch rest satisfied with these arbitrary and despotic proceedings in the church; he excited tumults and factions in the state, and, with an unparalleled spirit of rebellion and arrogance, encroached upon the prerogatives of the throne, and attempted to give law to the emperor himself. Hence arose civil commotions, conspiracies, and seditions, which excited in a little time the indignation of the emperor and the hatred of the people against the Jesuits, and produced, at length, in the year 1631, a public declaration from the throne, by which the Abyssinian monarch annulled the orders he had formerly given in favour of popery, and left his subjects at liberty, either to persevere in the doctrine of their ancestors, or to embrace the faith of *Rome*. This rational declaration was mild and indulgent towards the Jesuits, considering the treatment their insolence and presumption had so justly deserved; but in the following reign much severer measures were employed against them. BASILIDES, the son of SEGUED, who succeeded his father, in the year 1632, no sooner ascended the throne than he thought it expedient to rid his dominions of these troublesome and despotic guests; and accordingly, in the year 1634, he banished from the territories of *Ethiopia* the Patriarch MENDEZ, with all the Jesuits and Europeans that belonged to his retinue, and treated the Roman-catholic missionaries with excessive rigour and severity [u]. From this period the very names of *Rome*, its religion and its

[t] The reader will recollect that the *Abyssinians* differ but very little from the *Copts* in *Egypt*, and acknowledge the patriarch of ALEXANDRIA, as their spiritual chief. They receive the Old and New Testament, the Three first Councils, the Nicene Creed, and the Apostolical Constitutions. Their first conversion to Christianity is attributed, by some, to the famous prime minister of their Queen CANDACE, mentioned in the *Acts of the Apostles*; it is however probable, that the general conversion of that great empire was not perfected before the fourth century, when FRUMENTIUS, ordained bishop of *Axuma* by ATHANASIUS, exercised his ministry among them with the most astonishing success. They were esteemed a pure church before they fell into the errors of EUTYCHES and DIOSCORUS, and even since that period they are still a purer church than that of *Rome*.]

[u] See LUDOLFI *Histor. Aethiopica*, lib. iii. cap. xii.—GEDDES's *Church-History of Ethiopia*, p. 233.—LA CROZE, *Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie*, p. 79.—LOBO, *Voyage d'Abyssinie*, p. 116. 130. 144. with the additions of LE GRAND, p. 173. and the fourth *Dissertation* that is subjoined to the second volume. In this dissertation LE GRAND, himself a Roman-catholic, makes the following remark upon the conduct of the Patriarch MENDEZ: "It were to be wished *says he*, that the patriarch had never intermeddled in such a variety of affairs" (by which mitigated expression the author means his ambitious attempts to govern in the cabinet, as well as in the church) "nor carried his authority to such a height, as to behave in *Ethiopia* as if he had been in a country "where the *inquisition* was established. For by this conduct he set all the people against him, and pontif

pontif were objects of the highest aversion among the Abyssinians, who guarded their frontiers with the greatest vigilance and the strictest attention lest any Jesuit or Romish missionary should steal into their territories in disguise, and excite new tumults and commotions in the kingdom. The Roman pontifs, indeed, made more than one attempt to recover the authority they had lost by the ill success and misconduct of the Jesuits. They began by sending two Capuchin monks to repair their loss; but these unfortunate wretches were no sooner discovered than they were stoned to death. They afterwards employed more artful and clandestine methods of reviving the missions, and had recourse to the influence and intercession of LEWIS XIV, king of *France*, to procure admission for their emissaries into the Abyssinian empire [w]; but, as far as we have learnt, these attempts have hitherto proved unsuccessful, nor have the pontifs or their votaries been as yet able to calm the resentment of that exasperated nation, or to conquer its reluctance against the worship and jurisdiction of the church of *Rome* [x].

“excited in them such an aversion to the Roman-catholics in general, and to the Jesuits in particular, as nothing has been hitherto able to diminish, and which subsists in its full force to this day.”

[w] These projects are mentioned by CERRY, in his *État présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 217.—LE GRAND, in his *Supplement to LOBO's Itinerarium Æthiopicum*, tom. i. p. 181.*.—The reader, who would know what credit is to be given to what the Jesuits say of the attachment and veneration, which the Asiatic and African Christians express for the church of *Rome*, will do well to compare the relations of LE GRAND, who was a Roman-catholic, and no enemy to the Jesuits, and who drew his relations from the most authentic records, with those of PONCET, a French physician, who went into *Ethiopia* in the year 1698, accompanied by Father BREDEVENT, a Jesuit, who died during the voyage. This comparison will convince every ingenuous and impartial inquirer, that the accounts of the Jesuits are not to be trusted to, and that they surpass ancient Carthage, itself, in the art of deceiving. PONCET's Voyage is published in the fourth volume of the jesuitical work, entitled, *Lettres Curieuses et Edifiantes des Missions Etrangères*.

[x] LAFITAU and REBOULET, who have composed, each, a Life of Pope CLEMENT XI, tell us, that the emperor of *Abyssinia* desired the Roman pontif, in the year 1703, to send to his court missionaries and legates to instruct him and his people, and receive their submission to the see of *Rome*. These biographers go still further, and assert, that this monarch actually embraced the communion of *Rome*, in the year 1712. But these assertions are idle fictions, forged by the Jesuits and their creatures. It is well known, on the contrary, that so lately as a very few years ago, the edict prohibiting all Europeans to enter into *Ethiopia* was still in force, and was executed with the greatest severity. Even the Turks are included in this prohibition; and, what is still more remarkable, the Egyptian Monophysites, who have once entered within the Abyssinian territories, are not allowed to return into their own country. All these facts are confirmed by a modern writer of the most unquestionable authority, the learned and worthy M. MAILLET, the French consul general in *Egypt*, and ambassador from LEWIS XIV to the emperor of *Abyssinia*, in his *Description de l'Egypte*, part I. p. 325. which was published at *Paris* in 4^{to} in the year 1735. See also LE GRAND's *Supplement to LOBO's Itinerarium*, which was published in the year 1728. This last mentioned author, after having mentioned all the attempts that have been made, in our times, by the French nation and the Roman pontifs, to introduce Romish priests into *Abyssinia*, adds, that all such attempts must appear vain and chimerical to all those who have any knowledge of the empire of *Abyssinia*, and of the spirit and character of its inhabitants; his words are: *Toutes ces entreprises paroissent chimeriques à ceux qui connoissent l'Abissinie et les Abissins*. It is highly

[* Father LOBO, who resided nine years in *Ethiopia*, has given an elegant and lively, though simple and succinct description of that vast empire, in his *Itinerarium Æthiopicum*. This itinerary was translated into French by M. LE GRAND, and enriched by him with several curious anecdotes and dissertations. Hence Dr. MOSHEIM sometimes quotes the *Itinerarium* under the title of *Voyage d'Abissinie*, referring to LE GRAND's French translation of it.]

CENT. XVII.

The papal authority loses ground.

XVIII. Hitherto we have confined our views to the external state and condition of the church of *Rome*, and to the good or ill success that attended its endeavours to extend its dominion in the different parts of the world. It will be now proper to change the scene, to consider this church in its internal constitution, and to pass in review its polity, discipline, institutions, and doctrine. Its ancient form of government still remained; but its pontiffs and bishops lost, in many places, no small part of that extensive authority, they had so long enjoyed. The halcyon days were now over, in which the papal clergy excited with impunity seditious tumults in the state, intermeddled openly in the transactions of government, struck terror into the hearts of sovereigns and subjects by the thunder of their anathemas, and, imposing burthensome contributions on the credulous multitude, filled their coffers by notorious acts of tyranny and oppression. The pope, himself, though still honoured with the same pompous titles and denominations, found nevertheless frequently, by a mortifying and painful experience, that these titles had lost a considerable part of their former signification, and that the energy of these denominations diminished from day to day. For now almost all the princes and states of *Europe* had adopted that important maxim that had been formerly peculiar to the French nation: *that the power of the Roman pontif is entirely confined to matters of a religious and spiritual nature, and cannot, under any pretext whatsoever, extend to civil transactions or worldly affairs.* In the schools, indeed, and colleges of Roman-catholic countries, and in the writings of the Romish priests and doctors, the majesty of the pope was still exalted in the most emphatic terms, and his prerogatives displayed with all imaginable pomp. The Jesuits, also, who have been always ambitious of a distinguished place among the assertors of the power and pre-eminence of the Roman see, and who give themselves out for the pope's most obsequious creatures, raised their voices, in this ignoble cause, even above those of the schools and colleges. Nay, even in the courts of sovereign princes, very flattering terms and high-sounding phrases were sometimes used to express the dignity and authority of the head of the church. But, as it happens in other cases, that men's actions are frequently very different from their language, so was this observation particularly verified in the case of *Rome's Holy Father*. He was extolled in words, by those who despised him most in reality; and when any dispute arose between him and the princes of his communion, the latter respected his authority no further than they found expedient for their own purposes, and measured the extent of his prerogatives and jurisdiction, not by the slavish adulation of the colleges and the Jesuits, but by a regard to their own interests and independence.

The rupture between Paul V, and the Venetians.

XIX. This the Roman pontiffs learned by a disagreeable experience as often as they endeavoured, during this century, to resume their former pretensions, to interpose their authority in civil affairs, and encroach upon the jurisdiction of sovereign states. The conduct of PAUL V, and the consequence, that the new mission, which is preparing at *Rome* for the empire of *Abyssinia*, will prove a new instance of the solidity of M. LE GRAND's reflexion.

sequences

sequences that followed it, furnish a striking example, that abundantly verifies this observation. This haughty and arrogant pontif laid the Republic of *Venice* under an *Interdict* in the year 1606. The reasons alledged for this insolent proceeding, were the prosecution of two ecclesiastics for capital crimes; as also two wise edicts, one of which prohibited the erection of any more religious edifices in the Venetian territories, without the knowledge and consent of the senate; and the other, the alienation of any lay-possessions or estates in favour of the clergy, without the express approbation of the Republic. The Venetian senate received this papal insult with dignity, and conducted themselves under it with becoming resolution and fortitude. Their first step was to prevent their clergy from executing the *Interdict*, by an act prohibiting that cessation of public worship and that suspension of the sacraments which the pope had commanded in this imperious mandate. Their next step was equally vigorous; for they banished from their territories the Jesuits and Capuchin friars who obeyed the orders of the pope, in opposition to their express commands. In the process of this controversy they employed their ablest pens, and particularly that of the learned and ingenious PAUL SARPI, of the Order of *Servites*, to demonstrate, on the one hand, the justice of their cause, and to determine, on the other, after an accurate and impartial inquiry, the true limits of the Roman pontif's jurisdiction and authority. The arguments of these writers were so strong and urgent, that BARONIUS and the other learned advocates, whom the pope had employed in supporting his pretensions and defending his measures, struggled, in vain, against their irresistible evidence. In the mean time all things tended towards a rupture, and PAUL V was gathering together his forces in order to make war upon the Venetians, when HENRY IV, king of *France*, interposed as mediator [y], and concluded a peace, between the contending parties, on conditions, not very honourable to the ambitious pontif [z]. For the Venetians could not be persuaded to repeal the edicts

[(y) It must be observed here, that it was at the request of the pope, and not of the Venetians, that HENRY IV interposed as mediator. The Venetians had nothing to fear. Their cause was considered as the common cause of all the sovereign states of *Italy*; and the dukes of *Urbino*, *Modena*, and *Savoy* had already offered their troops and services to the Republic. But the rash pontif, perceiving the storm that was gathering against him, took refuge in the French monarch's intercession.

[z] Besides DE THOU and other historians, see DANIEL *Histoire de la France*, tom. x. p. 385. — HEIDEGGER's *Historia Papatus*, Period. vii. § CCXX. p. 322. — JO. WOLFG. JAEGERI *Historia Eccles.* SÆC. xvii. Decenn. i. p. 108. — More especially the writings of the famous PAUL SARPI, commonly called FRA-PAOLO, and of the other divines and canonists that defended the cause of the Republic, deserve a careful and attentive perusal. For these writings were composed with such solidity, learning, and eloquence, that they produced remarkable effects, and contributed much to open the eyes of several princes and magistrates; and to prevent their submitting blindly and implicitly, as their ancestors had done, to the imperious dictates of the Roman pontifs. Among the most masterly pieces, written in this cause, we must place FRA-PAOLO's *Istoria delle cose passate entre PAUL V, et la Republ. di Venetia*, published in 4^{to} at *Mirandola*, in the year 1624; and his *Historia Interdicti Veneti*, which was published in 4^{to} at *Cambridge*, in the year 1626, by Bishop BEDELL, who, during these troubles, had been chaplain to the English ambassador at *Venice*. PAUL V, by forcing the Venetians to publish to the world, in these admirable productions, his arrogance and temerity on the one hand, and many truths unfavourable to the pretensions of the

CENT. XVII. and resolutions they had issued out against the court of *Rome* upon this occasion, nor to recal the Jesuits from their exile [a].—It is remarkable, that, at the time of this rupture, the senate of *Venice* entertained serious thoughts of a total separation from the church of *Rome*, in which the ambassadors of *England* and *Holland* did all that was in their power to confirm them. But many considerations of a momentous nature intervened to prevent the execution of this design, which, as it would seem, had not the approbation of the sagacious and prudent FRA-PAOLO, notwithstanding his aversion to the tyranny and maxims of the court of *Rome* [b].

The contest between the Roman pontiffs and the court of *Portugal*.

XX. Had the Portuguese acted with the same wisdom and resolution, that distinguished the Venetians, their contest with the court of *Rome*, which begun under the pontificate of URBAN VIII, in the year 1641, and was carried on until the year 1666, would have been terminated in a manner equally disadvantageous to the haughty pretensions of the Roman pontiffs. The Portuguese, unable to bear any longer the tyranny and oppression of the Spanish government, threw off the yoke, and chose Don JOHN, duke of *Braganza*, for their king. URBAN VIII and his successors in the see of *Rome* obstinately refused, notwithstanding the most earnest and pressing solicitations both of the French and Portuguese, either to acknowledge Don JOHN's title to the crown, or to confirm the bishops, whom this prince had named to fill the vacant sees in *Portugal*. Hence it happened, that the greatest part of the kingdom remained for a long time without bishops. The pretended vicar of Christ upon earth, whose character ought to set

popes, on the other, was the occasion of the greatest perplexities and oppositions that the court of *Rome* had to encounter in after-times.

[a] When the peace was made between the Venetians and the pope, in the year 1607, the Capuchins and the other ecclesiastics, that had been banished on account of their partiality to the cause of *Rome*, were all re-instated in their respective functions, except the Jesuits. These latter, however, were recalled, in the year 1657, under the pontificate of ALEXANDER VII, in consequence of the earnest and importunate requests of LEWIS XIV, king of *France*, and several other princes, who gave the Venetians no rest until they re-admitted these dangerous guests into their territories. It is, nevertheless, to be observed, that the Jesuits never recovered the credit and influence they had formerly enjoyed in that Republic, nor, at this present time, is there any people, of the Romish communion, among whom their society has less power than among the Venetians, who have never yet forgot their rebellious behaviour during the quarrel now mentioned. See the *Voyage Historique en Italie, Allemagne, Suisse* (published at *Amsterdam* in 8^{vo} in the year 1736) tom. i. p. 291. It is further worthy of observation, that, since this famous quarrel between the Republic of *Venice* and the court of *Rome*, the bulls and rescripts of the popes have just as much authority in that Republic, as its senate judges consistent with the rules of wise policy and the true interests and welfare of the community. For a proof of this we need go no further than the respectable testimony of Cardinal HENRY NORIS, who, in the year 1676, wrote to MAGLIABECCHI in the following terms: *Poche Bulle passavano quelle acque verso la parte del Adriatico, per le massime lasciate nel Testamento di FRA-PAOLO, i. e. Few papal Bulls pass Po, or approach the coasts of the Adriatic sea; the maxims bequeathed to the Venetians by FRA-PAOLO render this passage extremely difficult.*

[b] This design of the Venetians is particularly mentioned by BURNET, in his *Life of Bishop BEDEL*, and by LE COURAYER, in his *Defense de la Nouvelle Traduction de l'Histoire du Concile de Trente* (published in 8^{vo} at *Amsterdam* in the year 1742) p. 35. This latter writer shews plainly, that FRA-PAOLO, though his sentiments differed, in many points, from the doctrine of the church of *Rome*, yet did not approve of all the tenets received by the Protestants, nor suggest to the Venetians the design of renouncing the Romish faith.

him above the fear of man, was so slavishly apprehensive of the resentment CENT. XVII. of the king of *Spain*, that, rather than offend that monarch, he violated the most solemn obligations of his station by leaving such a number of churches without pastors and spiritual guides. The French and other European courts advised and exhorted the new king of *Portugal* to follow the noble example of the Venetians, and to assemble a national council, by which the new-created bishops might be confirmed, in spite of the pope, in their respective sees. Don JOHN seemed disposed to listen to their counsels, and to act with resolution and vigour at this important crisis; but his enterprising spirit was checked by the formidable power of the *inquisition*, the incredible superstition of the people, and the blind zeal and attachment that the nation, in general, discovered for the person and authority of the Roman pontif. Hence the popes continued their insults with impunity; and it was not before the peace concluded between *Portugal* and *Spain*, five and twenty years after this revolution, that the bishops, nominated by the king, were confirmed by the pope. It was under the pontificate of CLEMENT IX that an accommodation was brought about between the courts of *Portugal* and *Rome*. It must indeed be observed, to the honour of the Portuguese, that, notwithstanding their superstitious attachment to the court of *Rome*, they vigorously opposed its ambitious pontif in all his attempts to draw from this contest an augmentation of his power and authority in that kingdom; nor did the bishops permit, in their respective sees, any encroachment to be made, at this time, upon the privileges and rights enjoyed by their monarchs in former ages [c].

XXI. There had subsisted during many preceding ages an, almost, uninterrupted misintelligence between the French monarchs and the Roman pontifs, which had often occasioned an open rupture, and which produced more than once that violent effect during this century. The greatest exertions of industry, artifice, and assiduous labour were employed by the popes, during the whole of this period, to conquer the aversion that the French had conceived against the pretensions and authority of the court of *Rome*, and to undermine imperceptibly, and enervate and destroy by degrees, the *liberties of the Gallican church*. In this arduous and important enterprize the Jesuits acted a principal part, and seconded, with all their dexterity and craft, the designs of the aspiring pontifs. But these attempts and stratagems were effectually defeated and disconcerted by the parliament of *Paris*; while many able pens exposed the tyranny and injustice of the papal claims. RICHER, LAUNOY, PETRUS DE MARCA, NATALIS ALEXANDER, ELLIES DU PIN, and others, displayed their learning and talents in this contest, though with different degrees of merit. They appealed to the ancient decrees of the Gallican church, which they confirmed by recent authorities and enforced by new and victorious arguments. It will naturally be

The contests between the French nation and the Roman pontifs.

[c] See GEDDES'S *History of the Pope's behaviour towards Portugal*, from 1641 to 1666, in his *Miscellaneous Tracts*, tom. ii. p. 73—186.—The cause of the Portuguese, in this quarrel, is defended with great learning and sagacity by a French writer, whose name was BULLIAD, in a book, entitled, *Pro Ecclesiis Lusitanis ad Clerum Gallicanum Libelli Duo*.

CENT. XVII. thought, that these bold and respectable defenders of the rights and liberties both of church and state were amply rewarded, for their generous labours, by peculiar marks of the approbation and protection of the court of *France*. But this was so far from being always the case, that they received, on the contrary, from time to time, several marks of its resentment and displeasure, designed to appease the rage and indignation of the threatening pontif, whom it was thought expedient to treat sometimes with artifice and caution. *Rome*, however, gained but little by this mild policy of the French court. For it has been always a prevailing maxim with the monarchs of that nation, that their prerogatives and pretensions are to be defended against the encroachments of the Roman pontifs with as little noise and contention as possible; and that pompous memorials and warm and vehement remonstrances are to be carefully avoided, except in cases of urgent necessity. Nor do these princes think it beneath their dignity to yield, more or less, to time and occasion, and even to pretend a mighty veneration for the orders and authority of the pontifs, in order to obtain from them by fair means the immunities and privileges which they look upon as their due. But they are, nevertheless, constantly on their guard; and, as soon as they perceive the court of *Rome* taking advantage of their lenity to extend its dominion, and the lordly popes growing insolent in consequence of their mildness and submission, they then alter their tone, change their measures, and resume the language that becomes the monarchs of a nation, that could never bear the tyranny and oppression of the papal yoke. All this appears evidently in the contests, that arose between the courts of *France* and *Rome* under the reign of LEWIS XIV, of which it will not be improper to give here some interesting instances [d].

And more especially those of
LEWIS XIV.

XXII. The first of these contests happened under the pontificate of ALEXANDER VII, and was owing to the temerity and insolence of his Corsican guards, who, in the year 1662, insulted the French ambassador and his lady, the duke and dutchess of CREQUI, at the instigation, as it is supposed, of the pope's nephews. LEWIS demanded satisfaction for this insult offered to his representative; and, on the pope's delaying to answer this demand, actually ordered his troops to file off for *Italy*, and to besiege the arrogant pontif in his capital. The latter, terrified by these warlike preparations, implored the clemency of the incensed monarch, who granted his pardon and absolution to the humbled pontif, and concluded a peace with him at *Pisa*, in the year 1664, upon the most inglorious and mortifying conditions. These conditions were, that the pope should send his nephew to *Paris* in the character of a suppliant for pardon; that he should brand the Corsican guards with perpetual infamy, and break them by a public edict; and should erect a pyramid at *Rome* with an inscription destined to preserve the

[(d) The large note [1] of the original, in which Dr. MOSHEIM has examined that interesting question, viz. *Whether or no the papal authority gained or lost ground in France during the seventeenth century*, is transposed by the translator into the text, and placed at the end of our author's account of LEWIS XIV's quarrels with the pope, where it comes in with the utmost propriety; see § xxiii.]

memory of this audacious instance of papal insolence, and of the exemplary manner in which it was chastised and humbled by the French monarch. It is however to be observed, that in this contest LEWIS did not chastise ALEXANDER, considered in his ghostly character as head of the church; but as a temporal prince, violating the law of nations [e]. He however shewed on other occasions, that when properly provoked, he was as much disposed to humble *papal* as *princely* ambition, and that he feared the *head of the church*, as little as the *temporal ruler* of the ecclesiastical state. This appeared evidently by the important and warm debate he had with INNOCENT XI, considered in his *spiritual* character, which began about the year 1678, and was carried on with great animosity and contention for several years after. The subject of this controversy was a *right*, called, in *France*, *the regale*, by which the French king, upon the death of a bishop laid claim to the revenues and fruits of his see, and discharged also several parts [f] of the episcopal function, until a new bishop was elected. LEWIS was desirous that all the churches in his dominions should be subject to the *regale*. INNOCENT pretended, on the contrary, that this claim could not be granted with such universality, nor would he consent to any augmentation of the prerogatives of this nature, that had formerly been enjoyed by the kings of *France*. Thus the claims of the prince and the remonstrances of the pontif, both urged with warmth and perseverance, formed a sharp and violent contest, which was carried on, on both sides, with spirit and resolution. The pontif sent forth his bulls and mandates. The monarch opposed their execution by the terror of penal laws and the authority of severe edicts against all who dared to treat them with the smallest regard. When the pontif refused to confirm the bishops, that were nominated by the monarch, the latter took care to have them consecrated and inducted into their respective sees; and thus, in some measure, declared to the world, that the Gallican church could govern itself without the intervention of the Roman pontif. INNOCENT XI, who was a man of a high spirit, and inflexibly obstinate in his purposes, did not lose courage at a view of these resolute and vigorous proceedings, but threatened the monarch with the divine vengeance, issued out bull after bull, and did every thing in his power to convince his adversaries, that the vigour and intrepidity, which formerly distinguished the lordly rulers of the Romish church, were not yet totally extinguished [g]. This obstinacy, however, only served to add fuel to the indignation and

[e] See JAEGERI *Histor. Eccles. Sæc. xvii. Decenn. vii. lib. ii. cap. ii. p. 180.*—VOLTAIRE, *Siecle de LOUIS XIV. tom. i. p. 131. Edit. de Dresde 1753.*—ARCKENHOLTZ, *Memoires de la Reine CHRISTINE, tom. ii. p. 72.*

[(f)] The author means here, undoubtedly, the collation of all benefices, which became vacant in the diocese of a deceased bishop before the nomination of his successor. This right of collation, in such cases, was comprehended in the *Regale*; see note (b).

[g] See JO. HEN. HEIDEGGERI *Historia Papatus, Period. vii. § cccxli. p. 555.*—VOLTAIRE, *Siecle de LOUIS XIV. tom. i. p. 221. Edit. de Dresde 1753.* A great number of writers have either incidentally or professedly treated the subject of the *Regale*, and have given ample accounts of the controversies it has occasioned. But none has traced out more circumstantially the rise and progress of this famous right than Cardinal HENRY NORIS, in his *Istoria delle Investiture Ecclesiast.* p. 547. which is inserted in the fourth volume of his works:

CENT. XVII. repentment of LEWIS. And accordingly, that monarch summoned the famous assembly of bishops [b] which met at *Paris*, in the year 1682. In this convocation the ancient doctrine of the Gallican church, that declares the power of the pope to be *merely* spiritual, and also inferior to that of a general council, was drawn up anew in four propositions [i], which were solemnly adopted by the whole assembly, and were proposed to the whole body of the clergy and to all the universities throughout the kingdom, as a sacred and inviolable rule of faith. But even this respectable decision of the matter, which gave such a mortal wound to the authority of *Rome*, did not shake the constancy of its resolute pontif, or reduce him to silence [k].

Another contest arose, some time after the one now mentioned, between these two princes, whose mutual jealousy and dislike of each other contributed much to inflame their divisions. This new dispute broke out in the year 1687, when INNOCENT XI wisely resolved to suppress the franchises and the *right of asylum* that had formerly been enjoyed by the ambassadors residing at *Rome* [l], and had, on many occasions, proved a sanctuary for

[b] This assembly, which consisted of thirty-five bishops, and as many deputies of the second Order, extended the Regale to all the churches in *France* without exception. The bishops, at the same time, thought proper to represent it to the king as their humble opinion, that those ecclesiastics, whom he should be pleased to nominate, during the vacancy of the see, to benefices attended with cure of souls, were obliged to apply for induction and confirmation to the grand-vicars appointed by the chapters.]

[i] These four propositions were to the following purpose:

1. That neither St. PETER nor his successors have received from God any power to interfere directly or indirectly in what concerns the temporal interests of princes and sovereign states; that kings and princes cannot be deposed by ecclesiastical authority, nor their subjects freed from the sacred obligation of fidelity and allegiance, by the power of the church or the bulls of the Roman pontif.

2. That the decrees of the council of *Constance*, which maintain the authority of general councils, as superior to that of the popes, in spiritual matters, are approved and adopted by the Gallican church.

3. That the rules, customs, institutions, and observances, which have been received in the Gallican church, are to be preserved inviolable.

4. That the decisions of the pope, in points of faith, are not infallible, unless they be attended with the consent of the church.]

[k] This pope was far from keeping silence with respect to the famous propositions mentioned in the preceding note. As they were highly unfavourable to his authority, so he took care to have them refuted and opposed both in private and in public. The principal champion for the papal cause, on this occasion, was Cardinal CELESTIN SPONDRATI, who, in the year 1684, published, under the feigned name of EUGENIUS LOMBARDUS, a treatise, entitled, *Regale Sacerdotium Romano Pontifici assertum et quatuor propositionibus explicatum*. This treatise was printed in *Switzerland*, as appears evidently by the characters or form of the letters. A multitude of Italian, German, and Spanish doctors stood forth to support the tottering majesty of the pontif against the court of *France*; and more especially the learned NICHOLAS DU BOIS, professor at *Louvain*, whose writings in defence of the pope are mentioned by BOSSUET. But all these papal champions were defeated by the famous prelate last-mentioned, the learned and eloquent bishop of *Meaux*, who, by the king's special order, composed that celebrated work, which appeared after his death, in two volumes in 4^{to}. and in the year 1730, under the following title: *Defensio Declarationis celeberrimæ, quam de Potestate Ecclesiastica sanxit Clerus Gallicanus, XIX Martii, MDCLXXXII, Luxemburgi*. The late publication of this work was owing to the prospect of a reconciliation between the courts of *France* and *Rome*, after the death of INNOCENT XI, which reconciliation actually took place, and engaged LEWIS XIV to prevent this work's being put to the press.

[l] This *right of asylum* extended much further than the ambassador's palace, whose immunity rapine,

rapine, violence, and injustice, by procuring impunity for the most heinous malefactars. The Marquis DE LAVARDIN refused, in the name of the French king, to submit to this new regulation; and LEWIS took all the violent methods, that pride and resentment could invent, to oblige the pontif to restore to his ambassador the immunities abovementioned [m]. INNOCENT, on the other hand, persisted in his purpose, opposed the king's demands in the most open and intrepid manner, and could not be wrought upon by any consideration to yield, even in appearance, to his ambitious adversary [n]. His death, however, put an end to this long debate, which had proved really detrimental to both of the contending parties. His successors, being men of a softer and more complaisant disposition, were less averse to the concessions that were necessary to bring about a reconciliation, and to the measures that were adapted to remove the chief causes of these unseemly contests. They were not, indeed, so far unmindful of the papal dignity and of the interests of *Rome* as to patch up an agreement on inglorious terms. On the one hand, the right of *asylum* was suppressed with the king's consent; on the other, the right of the *regale* was settled with certain modifications [o]. The four famous *propositions*, relating to the pope's authority and jurisdiction, were softened, by the king's permission, in private letters addressed to the pontif by certain bishops; but they were neither abrogated by the prince, nor renounced by the clergy; on the contrary, they still remain in force, and occupy an eminent place among the laws of the kingdom.

XXIII. [p] Several Protestant writers of eminent merit and learning lament the accessions of power and authority, which the Roman pontifs are supposed to have gained, in *France*, during the course of this century. They tell us, with sorrow, that the Italian notions of the papal majesty and jurisdiction, which the French nation had, in former ages, looked upon with abhorrence, gained ground now, and had infected, not only the nobility and clergy, but almost all ranks and orders of men; and from hence they conclude, that the famous *rights and liberties of the Gallican church* have suffered greatly by the perfidious stratagems of the Jesuits. They are led into this opinion by certain measures that were taken by the French court, and which seemed to favour the pretensions of the Roman pontif. They are confirmed in it by the declamations of the Jansenists and other modern writers among the French, who complain of the high veneration that was

Whether or no the papal authority gained ground in this century.

the pope did not mean to violate; it comprehended a considerable extent of ground, which was called a *quarter*, and undoubtedly gave occasion to great and crying abuses.]

[m] The Marquis DE LAVARDIN began his embassy by entering into *Rome*, surrounded with a thousand men in arms.]

[n] JAEGERI *Historia Ecclesiasticæ*. Sæc. xvii. Decenn. ix. p. 19.—*Legatio LAVARDINI*, which was published in 1688.—But above all, *Memoires de la Reine CHRISTINE*, tom. ii. p. 248. For CHRISTINA took part in this contest, and adopted the cause of the French monarch.

[o] See FLEURY, *Institutions du Droit Ecclesiastique François*, which excellent work is translated into Latin. [Dr. MOSHEIM refers to p. 454. of the Latin Version.]

[[p] This § xxiii. contains the ample note [I], which is to be found at p. 880. of the original. It comes in here with more propriety.]

paid

CENT. XVII. paid to the papal bulls, during this century; of the success of the Jesuits in instilling into the minds of the king and his counsellors the maxims of *Rome*, and an excessive attachment to its bishop; of the violence and ill treatment that were offered to all those who adhered steadfastly to the doctrine and maxims of their forefathers; and of the gradual attempts that were made to introduce the formidable tribunal of the *inquisition* into *France*. But it will perhaps appear, on mature consideration, that too much stress is laid, by many, on these complaints; and that the *rights and liberties* of the Gallican church were, in this century, and are, actually at this day, in the same state and condition, in which we find them, during those earlier ages of which the writers and declaimers abovementioned incessantly boast. It might be asked, where are the victories that are said to have been obtained over the French by the popes of *Rome*, and which some Protestant doctors, lending a credulous ear to the complaints of the Jansenists and *Appellants*, think they perceive with the utmost clearness? I am persuaded it would be difficult, if not impossible, to give a satisfactory answer, in the affirmative, to this question.

It is true, indeed, that as the transactions of government, in general, are now carried on in *France* with much more subtilty, secrecy, and art, than in former times; so, in particular, the stratagems and machinations of the Roman pontiffs have been opposed and defeated with more artifice, and less noise, than in those more rude and unpolished ages, when almost every contest was terminated by brute force and open violence. The opposition between the court of *France* and the bishop of *Rome* still subsists; but the manner of terminating their differences is changed; and their debates are carried on with less clamour, though not certainly with less animosity and vigour, than in the times of old. This new and prudent manner of disputing is not agreeable to the restless, fiery, and impatient temper of the French, who have an irresistible propensity to noisy, clamorous, and expeditious proceedings; and hence, undoubtedly, arise all the complaints we have heard, and still hear, of the decline of the liberties of the Gallican church in consequence of the growing influence and perfidious counsels of the Jesuits. If those, however, who are accustomed to make these complaints, would, for a moment, suspend their prejudices, and examine with attention the history and also the present state of their country, they would soon perceive, that their ecclesiastical *liberties* [q], instead of declining, or of being neglected by their monarchs, are maintained and preserved with more care, resolution, and foresight than ever. It must indeed be acknowledged, that, in *France*, there are multitudes of cringing slaves, who basely fawn upon the Roman pontiffs, exalt their prerogatives, revere their majesty, and, through the dictates of superstition, interest, or ambition, are ever ready to

[(q) It is not necessary to advertise the reader that by these *liberties* are not meant, that rational and Christian liberty, which entitles every individual to follow the light of his own conscience and the dictates of his own judgment in religious matters; for no such liberty is allowed in *France*. The *liberties* of the *Gallican church* consist in the opposition which that church has made, at different times, to the overgrown power of the Roman pontif, and to his pretended *personal infallibility*.]

hug the papal chain, and submit their necks blindly to the yoke of those ghostly tyrants. But it may be proved by the most undoubted facts, and by innumerable examples, that these servile creatures of the pope abounded as much in *France* in former ages, as they do at this day; and it must be also considered, that it is not by the counsels of this slavish tribe that the springs of government are moved, or the affairs of state and church transacted. It must be further acknowledged, that the Jesuits have arrived at a very high degree of influence and authority [*r*], and sometimes have credit enough to promote measures that don't at all appear consistent with the rights of the Gallican church, and must consequently be considered as heavy grievances by the patrons of the ancient ecclesiastical liberty. But here it may be observed, on the one hand, that many such measures have been proposed and followed before the rise of the Jesuits; and, on the other, that many affairs of great consequence are daily transacted in a manner highly displeasing and detrimental to that society, and extremely disagreeable to the Roman pontiffs. If it be alledged, that those, who defend with learning and judgment the ancient doctrines and maxims of the Gallican church scarcely escape public censure and punishment, and that those who maintain them with vehemence and intemperate zeal are frequently rewarded with exile or a prison; nay, that the most humble and modest patrons of these doctrines are left in obscurity without encouragement or recompence:—all this must be granted. But it must be considered, on the other hand, that the cause they maintain, and the ancient doctrines and maxims they defend, are not condemned nor even deserted; the matter is only this, that the prince and his ministry have fallen upon a new method of maintaining and supporting them. It appears, to them, much more conducive to public peace and order, that the stratagems and attempts of the Roman pontiffs should be opposed and defeated by secret exertions of resolution and vigour, without noise or ostentation, than by learned productions and clamorous disputes: which, for the most part, excite factions in the kingdom, inflame the spirits of the people, throw the state into tumult and confusion, exasperate the pontiffs, and alienate them still more and more from the French nation. In the mean time the doctors and professors, who are placed in the various seminaries of learning, are left at liberty to instruct the youth in the ancient doctrine and discipline of the church, and to explain and inculcate those maxims and laws by which, in former times, the papal authority was restrained and confined within certain limits. If these laws and maxims are not observed, and if even violent methods are employed against those who adhere stedfastly to them, this happens but very rarely, and never but when some case of extreme necessity, or the prospect of some great advantage to the community, absolutely require their suspension. Besides, those who sit at the political helm, always

[*r*] Dr. MOSHEIM wrote this in the year 1753, before the suppression of the Order of Jesuits in *France*. The downfall of that society, and the circumstances that have attended it, seem both to illustrate and confirm his judicious notion with respect to the degree of credit and influence which the popes have had, in that kingdom, for some time past.]

CENT. XVII. take care to prevent the pope's reaping much benefit from this suspension or neglect of the ancient laws and maxims of the church. This circumstance, which is of so much importance in the present question, must appear evident to such, as will be at the pains to look into the history of the debates that attended, and the consequences that followed, the reception of the *Bull Unigenitus* in France, than which no papal edict could seem more repugnant to the rights and liberties of the Gallican church. But in the business of this *Bull*, as in other transactions of a like nature, the court proceeded upon this political maxim, that a smaller evil is to be submitted to, when a greater may be thereby prevented.

In a word the kings of France have almost always treated the Roman pontiffs, as the heroes, who are said in Pagan story to have descended into *Tartarus*, behaved towards the triple-jawed guardian of that lower religion: sometimes they offered a soporiferous cake to suppress his grumbling and menacing tone; at others, they terrified him with their naked swords and the din of arms; and this with a view to stop his barking, and to obtain the liberty of directing their course in the manner they thought proper. There is nothing invidious designed by this comparison, which certainly represents, in a lively manner, the caresses and threatnings, that were employed by the French monarchs, according to the nature of the times, the state of affairs, the character of the pontiffs, and other incidental circumstances, in order to render the court of Rome favourable to their designs. We have dwelt perhaps too much upon this subject; but we thought it not improper to undeceive many protestant writers, who, too much influenced by the bitter complaints and declamations of certain Jansenists, and not sufficiently instructed in the history of these ecclesiastical contentions, have formed erroneous notions concerning the point we have here endeavoured to examine and discuss.

The state of the
Romish clergy.

XXIV. The corruptions, that had been complained of, in preceding ages, both in the higher and inferior Orders of the Romish clergy, were rather increased than diminished during this century, as the most impartial writers of that communion candidly confess. The bishops were rarely indebted for their elevation, to their eminent learning or superior merit. The intercession of potent patrons, services rendered to men in power, connexions of blood, and simoniacal practices were, generally speaking, the steps to preferment; and, what was still more deplorable, their promotion was sometimes owing to their vices. Their lives were such as might be expected from persons, who had risen in the church by such unseemly means; for had they been obliged, by their profession, to give public examples of those vices which the holy laws of the Gospel so solemnly and expressly condemn, instead of exhibiting patterns of sanctity and virtue to their flock, they could not have conducted themselves otherwise than they did [s]. Some indeed there were, who, sensible of the obligations of their

[s] The reader may see these disagreeable accounts of the corruptions of the clergy confirmed by a great number of unexceptionable testimonies, drawn from the writings of the most eminent doctors of the Romish church, in the *Memoires de Port Royal*, tom. ii. p. 308.

profession,

profession, displayed a truly Christian zeal in administering useful instruction and exhibiting pious examples to their flock, and exerted their utmost vigour and activity in opposing the vices of the sacred Order, in particular, and the licentiousness of the times in general. But these rare patrons of virtue and piety were either ruined by the resentment and stratagems of their envious and exasperated brethren, or were left in obscurity without that encouragement and support, that were requisite to enable them to execute effectually their pious and laudable purposes. The same treatment fell to the lot of those among the lower order of the clergy, who endeavoured to maintain the cause of truth and virtue. But the number of sufferers in this noble cause was small, compared with the multitude of corrupt ecclesiastics, who were carried away with the torrent instead of opposing it, and whose lives were spent in scenes of pleasure, or in the anxiety and toils of avarice and ambition. While we acknowledge that, among the bishops and inferior clergy, there were several exceptions from that general prevalence of immorality and licentiousness with which the sacred Order was chargeable, it is also incumbent upon us to do justice to the merit of some of the Roman pontiffs, in this century, who used their most zealous endeavours to reform the manners of the clergy, or, at least, to oblige them to observe the rules of external decency in their conduct and conversation. It is however matter of surprize, that these pontiffs did not perceive the unsurmountable obstacles to the success of their counsels and the fruits of their wise and salutary edicts, that arose from the internal constitution of the Romish church, and the very nature of the papal government. For even were the Roman pontiffs divinely inspired and really infallible; yet unless this inspiration and infallibility were attended with a miraculous power, and with the supernatural privilege of being present in many places at the same time, it is not conceivable how they should ever entertain a notion of the possibility of restoring or maintaining order, or good morals, among that prodigious multitude of persons of all classes and characters, that are subject to their jurisdiction.

XXV. Though the monks, in several places, behaved with much more circumspection and decency than in former times, yet they had every where departed, in a great measure, from the spirit of their founders and the primitive laws of their respective institutions. About the commencement of this century, their convents and colleges made a most wretched and deplorable figure, as we learn from the accounts of the wisest and most learned even of their own writers. But we find, further on, several attempts made to remove this disorder. The first were made by some wise and pious Benedictines, who, in *France* and other countries, reformed several monasteries of their Order, and endeavoured to bring them back, as near as was possible, to the laws and discipline of their founder [1]. Their example was followed

The state of the
monastic Orders.

[1] LE BOEUF, *Memoires sur l'Histoire d'Auxerre*, tom. ii. p. 513. where there is an account of the first Reforms made in the convents during this century.—See MARTENE's *Voyage Littéraire de deux Benedictins*, part II. p. 97.

CENT. XVII.

by the monks of *Clugni*, the Cistercians, the regular canons, the Dominicans and Franciscans [u]. It is from this period, that we are to date the division of the monastic Orders into two general classes; one of these comprehends the *Reformed* monks, who, reclaimed from that licentiousness and corruption of manners that had formerly dishonoured their societies, lead more strict and regular lives, and discover in their conduct a greater regard to the primitive laws of their Order. The other is composed of the *Un-reformed* Orders, who, forgetting the spirit of their founders and the rules of their institute, spend their days in ease and pleasure, and have no taste for the austerities and hardships of the monastic life. The latter class is by far the most numerous; and the greatest part, even of the *Reformed* monks, do not only come short of that purity of manners which their *rule* enjoins, but are, moreover, gradually and imperceptibly relapsing into their former indolence and disorder.

The Congregation of *St. Maur*.

XXVI. Among the *Reformed* monks, a particular degree of attention is due to certain Benedictine societies or *congregations*, who surpass all the other monastic Orders both in the excellence and utility of their rules and constitution, and in the zeal and perseverance with which they adhere to them. The most famous of these societies is the *Congregation of St. Maur* [w], which was founded, in the year 1620, by the express order of GREGORY XV, and was enriched by URBAN VIII, in the year 1627, with several donations, and privileges. It does not, indeed, appear that even this society adheres strictly to the spirit and maxims of BENEDICT, whose name it bears, nor is it beyond the reach of censure in other respects; but these imperfections are compensated by the great number of excellent rules and institutions that are observed in it, and by the regular lives and learned labours of its members. For in this congregation there is a select number of persons, who are distinguished by their genius and talents, set apart for the study of sacred and profane literature, and more especially of history and antiquities; and this learned part of the society is furnished with all the

[u] There is an account of all the convents, Reformed in this century, in HELYOT's *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. v, vi, vii. to which, however, several interesting circumstances may be added by consulting other writers. The *Reform* of the monks of *Clugni* is amply described by the Benedictines, in the *Gallia Christiana*, tom. vii. p. 544. The same authors speak of the *Reform* of the *Regular Canons of St. AUGUSTIN*, tom. vii. p. 778. 787. 790.—For an account of that of the *Cistercians*, see MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 121.—*Voyage Litteraire de deux Benedictins*, tom. i. p. 7, 8. tom. ii. p. 133. 229. 269. 303. The *Cistercians* were no sooner *Reformed* themselves, than they used their most zealous endeavours for the reformation of their whole society (i. e. of the Benedictine Order), but in vain. See MEAUPOU, *Vie de l'Abbé de la Trappe*, tom. i. p. 192.

[w] See the *Gallia Christiana Nova*, an admirable work composed by the *Congregation of St. Maur*, tom. vii. p. 474.—HELYOT, *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. vi. cap. xxxvii. p. 256. The letters patent of Pope GREGORY XV, by which the establishment of this famous Congregation was approved and confirmed, were criticised with great severity and rigour by LAUNOY, that formidable scourge of all the monastic Orders, in his *Examen privil. S. Germani*, tom. iii. p. i. opp. p. 303. The same author gives an account of the dissensions that arose in this Congregation immediately after its establishment; but an account which favours too much of that partiality, that he was chargeable with whenever he treated of monastic affairs; see his *Affert. Inquisit. in privil. S. Medardi*, p. i. cap. lxxvi. p. 227. tom. iii. opp. p. ii.

means and materials of knowledge, in a rich abundance, and with every thing that can tend to facilitate their labours and render them successful [x]. It must be abundantly known to those, who have any acquaintance with the history and progress of learning in *Europe*, what signal advantages the Republic of letters has derived from the establishment of this famous *Congregation*, whose numerous and admirable productions have cast a great light upon all the various branches of philology and *Belles Lettres*, and whose researches have taken in the whole circle of science, philosophy excepted [y].

[x] The Benedictins celebrate, in pompous terms, the exploits of this *Congregation* in general, and more especially their zealous and successful labours in restoring order, discipline, and virtue in a great number of monasteries, which were falling into ruin through the indolence and corruption of their licentious members; see the *Voyage de deux Religieux Benedictins de la Congregation de St. Maur*, tom. i. p. 16. tom. ii. p. 47. This eulogy, though perhaps exaggerated, is not entirely unmerited; and there is no doubt, but the Benedictins have contributed much to restore the credit of the monastic Orders. There are nevertheless several classes of ecclesiastics in the Romish church, who are no well-wishers to this learned *Congregation*; though their dislike be founded on different reasons. In the first class, we may place a certain number of ambitious prelates, whose artful purposes have been disappointed by this ingenious fraternity; for the monks of *St. Maur*, having turned their principal studies towards ancient history and antiquities of every kind, and being perfectly acquainted with ancient records, diplomas, and charters, are thus peculiarly qualified to maintain their possessions, their jurisdiction and privileges, against the litigious pretensions of the bishops, and have, in fact, maintained them with more success than their Order could do in former times, when destitute of learning, or but ill-furnished with the knowledge of ancient history. The Jesuits form the second class of adversaries, with whom this learned *Congregation* has been obliged to struggle; for, their lustre and reputation being considerably eclipsed by the numerous and admirable productions of these Benedictins, they have used their utmost endeavours to sink, or at least to diminish, the credit of such formidable rivals. See SIMON, *Lettres Choises*, tom. iv. p. 36. 45. These Benedictins have a third set of enemies, who are instigated by superstition; and it is not improbable, that this superstition may be accompanied with a certain mixture of envy. To understand this fully, it must be observed, that the learned monks of whom we are now speaking, have substituted an assiduous application to the culture of philology and literature in the place of that bodily and manual labour, which the *Rule of St. BENEDICT* prescribes to his followers. The more robust, healthy, and vigorous monks are obliged to employ a certain portion of the day in working with their hands; while those of a weaker constitution and superior genius are allowed to exchange bodily for mental labour, and, instead of cultivating the lands or gardens of the convent, to spend their days in the pursuit of knowledge both human and divine. The lazy monks envy this bodily repose; and the superstitious and fanatical ones, who are vehemently prejudiced in favour of the ancient monastic discipline, behold with contempt these learned researches, as unbecoming the monastic character, since they tend to divert the mind from divine contemplation. This superstitious and absurd opinion was maintained, with peculiar warmth and vehemence, by ARMAND JOHN BOUTHELIER DE RANCE, abbot of *La Trappe*, in his book *Des devoirs monastiques*; upon which the Benedictins employed MABILLON, the most learned of their fraternity, to defend their cause and to expose the reveries of the abbot in their proper colours. This he did with remarkable success, in his famous book *De studiis monasticis*, which was first published in 8^{vo} at *Paris*, in the year 1691, passed afterwards through several editions, and was translated into different languages. Hence arose that celebrated question which was long debated with great warmth and animosity in *France*, viz. *How far a monk may, consistently with his character, apply himself to the study of literature?* There is an elegant and interesting history of this controversy given by VINCENT THULLIER, a most learned monk of the *Congregation of St. Maur*; see the *Opera Posthuma MABILLONII et RUINARTII*, tom. i. p. 365—425.

[y] The curious reader will find an account of the authors and learned productions with which the *Congregation of St. Maur* has enriched the Republic of Letters, in PH. LE CERF'S *Bibliothèque Historique et Critique des Auteurs de la Congregation de St. Maur*, published at the *Hague* in 8^{vo}. in 1726; and also in BERNARD PEZ'S *Bibliotheca Benedictino-Mauriana*, published in 8^{vo} at *Augsborg*, in 1716.—These Benedictins still maintain their literary fame by the frequent pub-

XXVII. Though

XXVII. Though these pious attempts to reform the monasteries were not entirely unsuccessful, yet the effects they produced, even in those places where they had succeeded most, came far short of that perfection of austerity that had seized the imaginations of a set of persons, whose number is considerable in the Romish church, though their credit be small and their severity be generally looked upon as excessive and disgusting. These rigid censors, having always in their eye the ancient discipline of the monastic Orders, and bent on reducing the modern convents to that austere discipline, looked upon the changes above mentioned as imperfect and trifling. They considered a monk, as a person obliged, by the sanctity of his profession, to spend his whole days in prayers, tears, contemplation, and silence, in the perusal of holy books and the hardships of bodily labour; nay, they went so far as to maintain, that all other designs and all other occupations, however laudable and excellent in themselves, were entirely foreign from the monastic vocation, and, on that account, vain and sinful in persons of that Order. This severe plan of monastic discipline was recommended by several persons, whose obscurity put it out of their power to influence many in its behalf; but it was also adopted by the Jansenists, who reduced it to practice in certain places [z], and in none with more success and reputation than in the female convent of *Port-Royal*, where it has subsisted from the year 1618, till our time [a]. These steps of the Jansenists excited a spirit of emulation, and several monasteries exerted themselves in the imitation of this austere model; but they were all surpassed by the famous BOUTHILLIER DE RANCE, abbot *de la Trappe* [b], who, with the most ardent zeal, and

lication of laborious and learned productions in all the various branches of sacred and profane literature.

[z] See the *Memoires de Port-Royal*, tom. ii. p. 601, 602.—MARTIN BARCOS, the most celebrated Jansenist of this century, introduced this austere rule of discipline into the monastery of *St. Cyran*, of which he was abbot. See the *Gallia Christiana*, tom. ii. p. 132.—MOLEON, *Voyages Liturgiques*, p. 135. But, after the death of this famous abbot, the monks of his cloister relapsed into their former disorder, and resumed their former manners. See *Voyage de deux Benedictins*, tom. i. p. i. p. 18.

[a] HELYOT, *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. v. cap. xlv. p. 455.

[(b) This illustrious abbot shewed very early an extraordinary genius for the *Belles Lettres*. At the age of ten he was master of several of the Greek and Roman poets, and understood HOMER perfectly. At the age of twelve or thirteen he gave an edition of *Anacreon*, with learned Annotations. Some writers alledge, that he had imbibed the voluptuous spirit of that poet, and that his subsequent application to the study of theology, in *Sorbonne*, did not extinguish it entirely. They also attribute his conversion to a singular incident. They tell us, that returning from the country, after six weeks absence from a lady whom he loved passionately (and not in vain), he went directly to her chamber by a back-stair, without having the patience to make any previous inquiry about her health and situation. On opening the door he found the chamber illuminated, and hung with black;—and, on approaching to the bed,—saw the most hideous spectacle that could be presented to his eyes, and the most adapted to mortify passion, inspire horror, and engender the gloom of melancholy devotion in a mind, too lively and too much agitated to improve this shocking change to the purposes of rational piety: he saw his fair mistress in her shroud—dead of the small-pox—all her charms fled—and succeeded by the ghastly lines of death, and the frightful marks of that terrible disorder.—From that moment, it is said, our abbot retired from the world, repaired to *La Trappe*, the most gloomy, barren, and desolate spot in the whole kingdom of *France*, and there spent the forty last years of his life in perpetual acts of the most austere piety.]

indefatigable

indefatigable labour attended with uncommon success, introduced into his monastery this discipline in all its austere and shocking perfection. This abbot, so illustrious by his birth and so remarkable for his extraordinary devotion, was so happy as to vindicate his fraternity from the charge of excessive superstition, which the Jansenists had drawn upon themselves by the austerity of their monastic discipline; and yet his society observed the severe and laborious rule of the ancient Cistercians, whom they even surpassed in abstinence, mortifications, and self-denial. This Order still subsists under the denomination of the *Reformed Bernardines of La Trappe*, and has several monasteries both in *Spain* and *Italy*; but if credit may be given to the accounts of writers, who seem to be well informed, it is degenerating gradually from the austere and painful discipline of its famous founder [c].

XXVIII. The Romish church, from whose prolific womb all the various forms of superstition issued forth in an amazing abundance, saw several new monastic establishments arise within its borders during this century. The greatest part of them we shall pass over in silence, and confine ourselves to the mention of those, which have obtained some degree of fame, or at least made a certain noise in the world.—

New monastic
Orders founded.

We begin with the *Fathers of the oratory of the Holy Jesus*, a famous Order instituted by Cardinal BERULLE, a man of genius and talents, who displayed his abilities with such success in the service both of state and church, that he was generally looked upon as equally qualified for shining in these very different spheres. This Order, which, both in the nature of its rules and in the design of its establishment, seems to be in direct opposition to that of the Jesuits, was founded in the year 1613, has produced a considerable number of persons eminent for their piety, learning, and eloquence, and still maintains its reputation in this respect. Its members, however, have, on account of certain theological productions, been suspected of introducing new opinions; and this suspicion has not only been raised, but is also industriously fomented and propagated, by their mortal enemies, the Jesuits. The priests, who enter into this society, are not obliged to renounce their property or possessions, but only to refuse all ecclesiastical cures or offices, to which any fixed revenues or honours are annexed, as long as they continue members of this fraternity, from which they are, however, at liberty to retire whenever they think proper [d]. While they continue in the Order, they are bound to perform, with the greatest fidelity and accuracy, all the priestly functions, and to turn the whole bent of their zeal and industry to one single point, even the preparing and qualifying themselves and others for discharging them daily with greater perfection, and more

[c] MARSOLIER, *Vie de l'Abbé de la Trappe*, published at Paris in 1702, in 4^{to}. and in 1703, in 2 vols. 12^{mo}.—MEAUPOU, *Vie de M. l'Abbé de la Trappe*, published at Paris in 2 vols. 8^o. in 1702.—FELIBIEN, *Description de l'Abbaye de la Trappe*, published at Paris in 1671.—HELYOT, *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. vi. cap. i. p. 1.

[d] The *Fathers or Priests* (as they are also called) of the oratory are not, properly speaking, religious, or monks, being bound by no vows, and their institute being purely ecclesiastical or sacerdotal.]

CENT. XVII. abundant fruits. If therefore we consider this Order in the original end of its institution, its convents may, not improperly, be called the schools of *sacerdotal divinity* [e]. It is nevertheless to be observed, that, in later times, the Fathers of the oratory have not confined themselves to this single object, but have imperceptibly extended their original plan, and applied themselves to the study of polite literature and theology, which they teach with reputation in their colleges [f].

After these *Fathers*, the next place is due to the *Priests of the missions*, an Order founded by VINCENT DE PAUL (who has obtained, not long ago, the honours of sainthood) and formed into a regular congregation, in the year 1632, by Pope URBAN VIII. The rule prescribed to this society, by its founder, lays its members under the three following obligations: *First*, to purify themselves, and to aspire daily to higher degrees of sanctity and perfection by prayer, meditation, the perusal of pious books, and other devout exercises: *Secondly*, to employ eight months of the year in the villages, and, in general, among the country-people, in order to instruct them in the principles of religion, form them to the practice of piety and virtue, accommodate their differences, and administer consolation and relief to the sick and indigent: *Thirdly*, to inspect and govern the seminaries in which persons designed for holy orders receive their education, and to instruct the candidates for the ministry in the sciences that relate to their respective vocations [g].

The *Priests of the missions* were also intrusted with the direction and government of a Female Order, called *Virgins of love*, or *Daughters of charity*, whose office it was to administer assistance and relief to indigent persons, who were confined to their beds by sickness and infirmity. This Order was founded by a noble virgin, whose name was LOUISA LE GRAS, and received, in the year 1660, the approbation of Pope CLEMENT IX [h].—The *Brethren and Sisters of the pious and Christian schools*, who are now, commonly, called *Pietists*, were formed into a society, in the year 1678, by NICHOLAS BARRE, and obliged, by their engagements, to devote themselves to the education of poor children of both sexes [i]. It would be endless to mention all the religious societies, which rose and fell, were formed by fits of

[e] See HABERT DE CERISI, *Vie du Cardinal BERULLE, fondateur de l'Oratoire de Jesus*, published at Paris in 4^{to}. in the year 1646.—MORINI *Vita Antiqq.* prefixed to his *Orientalia*, p. 3, 4, 5, 110.—R. SIMON, *Lettres Choiesies*, tom. ii. p. 60. et *Bibliothèque Critique* (published under the fictitious name of *Saint-Jorre*) tom. iii. p. 303. 324. 330. For an account of the genius and capacity of BERULLE, see BAILLEE, *Vie de RICHER*, p. 220—342.—LE VASSOR, *Histoire de LOUIS XIII.* tom. iii. p. 397.—HELYOT, *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. viii. cap. x. p. 53.—*Gallia Christiana Benedictinor.* tom. vii. p. 976.

[f] The *Fathers of the oratory* will now be obliged, in a more particular manner, to extend their plan, since, by the suppression of the Jesuits in France, the education of youth is committed to them.]

[g] ABELY, *Vie de VINCENT DE PAUL*, published in 4^{to} at Paris, in 1664.—HELYOT, *loc. cit.* tom. viii. cap. xi. p. 64.—*Gallia Christiana*, tom. vii. p. 998.

[h] GOBILLON, *Vie de Madame DE GRAS, Fondatrice des filles de la Charité*, published in 12^{mo} at Paris, in the year 1676.

[i] HELYOT, *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. viii. cap. xxx. p. 233.

zeal, and dissolved by external incidents or by their own internal principles of instability and decay. CENT. XVII.

XXIX. If the *Company of Jesus*, so called, which may be considered as the soul of the papal hierarchy, and the main spring that directs its motions, had not been invincible, it must have sunk under the attacks of those formidable enemies that, during the course of this century, assailed it on all sides and from every quarter. When we consider the multitude of the adversaries the *Jesuits* had to encounter, the heinous crimes with which they were charged, the innumerable affronts they received, and the various calamities in which they were involved, it must appear astonishing, that they yet subsist; and still more so, that they enjoy any degree of public esteem, and are not, on the contrary, sunk in oblivion or covered with infamy. In *France, Holland, Poland, and Italy*, they experienced, from time to time, the bitter effects of a warm and vehement opposition, and were, both in public and private, accused of the greatest enormities, and charged with maintaining pestilential errors and maxims, that were equally destructive of the temporal and eternal interests of mankind, by their tendency to extinguish the spirit of true religion, and to trouble the order and peace of civil society. The Jansenists, and all who espoused their cause, distinguished themselves, more especially, in this opposition. They composed an innumerable multitude of books in order to cover the sons of *LOYOLA* with eternal reproach, and to expose them to the hatred and scorn of the whole universe. Nor were these productions mere defamatory libels, dictated by malice alone, or pompous declamations, destitute of arguments and evidence. On the contrary, they were attended with the strongest demonstration, being drawn from undeniable facts, and confirmed by unexceptionable testimonies [k]. Yet all this was far from overturning that fabric of

The Society of
Jesuits.

[k] An account of this opposition to, and of these contests with, the *Jesuits*, would furnish matter for many volumes; since there is scarcely any Roman-catholic country, which has not been the theatre of violent divisions between the sons of *LOYOLA* and the magistrates, monks or doctors of the Romish church. In these contests the *Jesuits* seemed, almost, always to be vanquished; and, nevertheless, in the issue, they always came victorious from the field of controversy. A Jansenist writer proposed, some years ago, to collect into one relation the accounts of these contests that lie dispersed in a multitude of books, and to give a compleat history of this famous Order. The first volume of his work accordingly appeared at *Utrecht* in the year 1741, was accompanied with a curious *Preface*, and entitled *Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus*. If we may give credit to what this writer tells us of the voyages he undertook, the dangers and difficulties he encountered, and the number of years he spent in investigating the proceedings and in detecting the frauds and artifices of the *Jesuits*, we must certainly be persuaded, that no man could be better qualified for composing the history of this insidious Order. But this good man, returning imprudently into *France*, was discovered by his exasperated enemies the *Jesuits*, and is said to have perished miserably by their hands. Hence not above a third part of his intended work was either published or finished for the press. — [Some things may be added, both by way of correction and illustration, to what Dr. *MOSHEIM* has here said concerning this history of the *Jesuits* and its author. In the first place, its author or compiler is still alive, resides at the *Hague*, passes by the name of *BENARD*, is supposed to be a Jansenist, and a relation of the famous Father *QUENEL*, whom the *Jesuits* persecuted with such violence in *France*. He is a native of *France*, and belonged to the oratory; it is also true, that he went thither from *Holland* several years ago, and it was believed that he had fallen a victim to the resentment of the *Jesuits*, until his return to the *Hague* proved that report false. Secondly, This history is carried no further down than the year 1572,

CENT. XVII.

profound and insidious policy, which the Jesuits had raised under the protection of the Roman pontifs, and the connivance of deluded princes and nations. It seemed, on the contrary, as if the opposition of such a multitude of enemies and accusers had strengthened their interest instead of diminishing it, and added to their affluence and prosperity instead of bringing on their destruction. Amidst the storm, that threatned them with a fatal shipwreck, they directed their course with the utmost dexterity, tranquillity, and prudence. Thus they got safe into the desired harbour, and arose to the very summit of spiritual authority in the church of *Rome*. Avoiding rather than repelling the assaults of their enemies, opposing for the most part patience and silence to their redoubled insults, they proceeded uniformly and stedfastly to their great purpose, and they seem to have attained it. For those very nations, who formerly looked upon a Jesuit as a kind of monster and as a public pest, commit, at this day, some through necessity, some through choice, and others through both, a great part of their interests and transactions to the direction of this most artful and powerful society [1].

The state of
learning in the
church of *Rome*.

XXX. All the different branches of literature received, during this century, in the more polished Roman-catholic countries, a new degree of lustre

notwithstanding the express promises and engagements by which the author bound himself four and twenty years ago (in the Preface to his first volume) to publish the whole in a very short time, declaring that it was ready for the press. This suspension is far from being honourable to Mr. BENARD, who is still living at the *Hague*, and consequently at full liberty to accomplish his promise. This has made some suspect, that, though Mr. BENARD is too much out of the Jesuits reach to be influenced by their threatenings, he is not, however, too far from them to be moved by the eloquence of their promises, or stedfast enough to stand out against the *weighty* remonstrances they may have employed to prevent the further publication of his history. It may be observed *thirdly*, that the character of a traveller, who has studied the manners and conduct of the Jesuits in the most remarkable scenes of their transactions in *Europe* and the other parts of the globe, is here assumed by Mr. BENARD as the most pleasing manner of conveying the accounts which he compiled in his closet. These accounts don't appear to be false, though the character of a traveller assumed by the compiler be fictitious. It must be allowed, on the contrary, that Mr. BENARD has drawn his relations from good sources, though his style and manner cannot well be justified from the charge of acrimony and malignity.]

[1] It may perhaps be affirmed with truth, that none of the Roman-catholic nations attacked the Jesuits with more vehemence and animosity than the French have done upon several occasions; and it is certain, that the Jesuits in that kingdom have been, more than once, involved in great difficulties and distress. To be convinced of this, the reader has only to consult DU BOULAY's *Historia Academiae Parisiensis*, tom. vi. p. 559. 648. 676. 738. 742. 744. 763. 774. 874. 890. 898. 909. in which he will find an ample and accurate account of the resolutions and transactions of the parliament and university of *Paris*, and also of the proceedings of the people in general, to the detriment of this artful and dangerous society. But what was the final issue of all these resolutions and transactions, and in what did all this opposition end? I answer, in the exaltation and grandeur of the Jesuits. They had been banished with ignominy out of the kingdom, and were recalled from their exile and honourably restored to their former credit, in the year 1604, under the reign of HENRY IV, notwithstanding the remonstrances of many persons of the highest rank and dignity, who were shocked, beyond expression, at this unaccountably mean and ignoble step. See *Memoires de SULLY* (the modern edition published at *Geneva*), tom. v. p. 83. 314. After that period, they moved the main springs of government both in church and state, and still continue to sit, though invisibly, at the helm of both.—[The reader must again be advertised, that this note was written by Dr. MOSHEIM some years before the suppression of the society of the Jesuits in *France*.]

and

and improvement. *France, Spain, Italy, and the Netherlands* produced several men eminent for their genius, erudition, and acquaintance with the learned languages. This happy circumstance must not, however, be attributed to the labour of the schools, or to the methods and procedure of public education; for the old dry, perplexing, inelegant, scholastic method of instruction prevailed then, and, indeed, still takes place in both the higher and lower seminaries of learning; and it is the peculiar tendency of this method to damp genius, to depress instead of exciting and encouraging the generous efforts of the mind towards the pursuit of truth, and to load the memory with a multitude of insignificant words and useless distinctions. It was beyond the borders of these pedantic seminaries, that genius was encouraged, and directed by great and eminent patrons of science, who opened new paths to the attainment of solid learning, and presented the sciences under a new and engaging aspect to the studious youth. It must be observed here, in justice to the French, that they bore a distinguished part in this literary reformation. Excited by their native force of genius, and animated by the encouragement that learning and learned men received from the munificence of LEWIS XIV, they cultivated with success almost all the various branches of literature, and, rejecting the barbarous jargon of the schools, exhibited learning under an elegant and alluring form, and thereby multiplied the number of its votaries and patrons [m]. It is well known how much the example and labours of this polite nation contributed to deliver other countries from the yoke of scholastic bondage.

XXXI. The Aristotelians of this century were a set of intricate dialecticians, who had the name of the Stagirite always in their mouths, without the least portion of his genius, or any tolerable knowledge of his system; and they maintained their empire in the schools, notwithstanding the attempts that had been made to diminish their credit. It was long before the court of *Rome*, which beheld with terror whatever bore the smallest aspect of novelty, could think of consenting to the introduction of a more rational philosophy, or permit the modern discoveries in that noble science to be explained with freedom in the public seminaries of learning. This appears sufficiently from the fate of GALILEI, the famous mathematician of *Florence*, who was cast into prison by the court of *Inquisition* for adopting the sentiments of COPERNICUS, in relation to the constitution of the solar system. It is true, indeed, that DES CARTES and GASSENDI [n], the one by his new philosophy, and the other by his admirable writings, gave a mortal wound to the Peripatetics, and excited a spirit of liberty and emulation, that changed the face of science in *France*. It was under the auspicious influence of these adventurous guides that several eminent men of that nation abandoned the perplexed and intricate wilds of the philosophy, that was taught by the modern

The state of
philosophy.

[m] For an ample account of this matter, see VOLTAIRE'S *Siecle de LOUIS XIV*, and more especially the *Chapters* in the second volume, relative to the *Arts and Sciences*.

[n] See GASSENDI *Exercitationes paradoxæ adversus Aristoteleos. Operum*, tom. iii. This subtle and judicious work contributed perhaps more than any thing else to hurt the cause and ruin the credit of the Peripatetics.

CENT. XVII.

Aristotelians; and, throwing off the shackles of mere authority, dared to consult the dictates of reason and experience in the study of nature and in the investigation of truth. Among these converts to true philosophy several *Jesuits*, and a still greater number of *Jansenists* and *Priests of the oratory*, distinguished themselves; and, accordingly, we find in this list the respectable names of MALEBRANCHE, ARNAULD, LAMI, NICOLE, PASCAL, who acquired immortal fame by illustrating and improving the doctrine of DES CARTES, and accommodating it to the purposes of human life [o]. The modesty, circumspection, and self-diffidence of GASSENDI, who confessed the scanty measure of his knowledge, and pretended to no other merit than that of pointing out a rational method of arriving at truth, while others boasted that they had already found it out, rendered him disagreeable in *France*. The ardent curiosity, the fervor, precipitation, and impatience of that lively people, could not bear the slow and cautious method of proceeding, that was recommended by the cool wisdom of this prudent inquirer. They wanted to get at the summit of philosophy, without climbing the steps that lead to it.

Towards the conclusion of this century many eminent men, in *Italy* and in other countries, followed the example of the French in throwing off the yoke of the Peripatetics, and venturing into the paths that were newly opened for the investigation of truth. This desertion of the old philosophy was, at first, attended with that timorousness and secrecy, that arose from apprehensions of the displeasure and resentment of the court of *Rome*; but as soon as it was known, that the Roman pontiffs beheld with less indignation and jealousy the new discoveries in metaphysics, mathematics, and natural philosophy, then the deserters broke their chains with greater confidence, and proceeded with greater freedom and boldness in the pursuit of truth.

The respective merit of Jesuits, Benedictines, Priests of the oratory, and Jansenists, in the cultivation of sacred and profane literature.

XXXII. After this general account of the state of learning, in the Roman-catholic countries, it will not be improper to point out, in a more particular manner, those of the Romish writers, who contributed most to the propagation and improvement both of sacred and profane erudition during the course of this century. The Jesuits were, for a long time, not only possessed of an undisputed pre-eminence in this respect, but were, moreover, considered as almost the sole fountains of universal knowledge, and the only religious Order that made any figure in the literary world. And it must be confessed by all, who are not misled by want of candor or of proper information, that this famous society was adorned by many persons of uncom-

[o] These great men were, indeed, very ill-treated by the Peripatetics on account of their learned and excellent labours. They were accused, by these exasperated scholastics, of irreligion, and were even charged with atheism, by Father HARDOUIN, who was really intoxicated with the large draughts he had taken from the muddy fountains of peripatetic and scholastic science. See his *Athei Detecti*, in his *Opp. Posthum.* p. 1 & 1259.—It is easy to perceive the reasons of all this resentment; since the Cartesian system, which aimed at restoring the authority of reason and the light of true philosophy, was by no means so proper to defend the pretensions of *Rome*, and the cause of popery, as the dark and intricate jargon of the Peripatetics.

mon genius and learning. The names of PETAU, SIRMOND, POUSSINES, LABBE, and ABRAM, will live as long as letters shall be held in honour; and even that of HARDOVIN, notwithstanding the singularity of his disordered fancy, and the extravagance of many of his opinions, will escape oblivion.

It is, at the same time, to be observed, that the literary glory of the Jesuits suffered a remarkable eclipse, during the course of this century, from the growing lustre of the *Benedictine* Order, and more especially of the *Congregation of St. Maur*. The *Jesuits* were perpetually boasting of the eminent merit and lustre of their *society* on the one hand, and exposing, on the other, to public contempt the ignorance and stupidity of the *Benedictins*, who, indeed, formerly made a very different figure from what they do at present. Their view, in this, was to form a plausible pretext for invading the rights of the latter, and engrossing their ample revenues and possessions; but the *Benedictins* resolved to disconcert this insidious project, to wipe off the reproach of ignorance that had heretofore been cast upon them with too much justice, and to disappoint the rapacious avidity of their enemies, and rob them of their pretexts. For this purpose, they not only erected schools, in their monasteries, for the instruction of youth in the various branches of learning and science; but also employed such of their select members, as were distinguished by their erudition and genius, in composing a variety of learned productions, that were likely to survive the waste of time, adapted to vindicate the honour of the fraternity, and to reduce its enemies to silence. This important task has been executed with incredible ability and success by MABILLON, D'ACHERY, MASSUET, RUINART, BEAUGENDRE, GARNIER, DE LA RUE, MARTENE, MONTFAUCON, and other eminent men of that learned Order. It is to these *Benedictins* that we are indebted for the best editions of the Greek and Latin fathers; — for the discovery of many curious records and ancient documents, that throw a new light upon the history of remote ages, and upon the antiquities of various countries; — for the best accounts of ancient transactions, whether ecclesiastical or political, and of the manners and customs of the earliest times; — for the improvement of chronology and the other branches of literature. In all these parts of philology and *Belles Lettres*, the religious Order, now under consideration, has shone with a distinguished lustre, and given specimens of their knowledge, discernment, and industry, that are worthy of being transmitted to the latest posterity. It would be perhaps difficult to assign a reason for that visible decline of learning among the *Jesuits*, that commenced precisely at that very period, when the *Benedictins* began to make this eminent figure in the Republic of Letters. The fact, however, is undeniable; and the *Jesuits* have long been at a loss, to produce any one or more of their members, who are qualified to dispute the pre-eminence, or even to claim an equality with the *Benedictins*. The latter still continue to shine in the various branches of philology, and almost every year enrich the literary world with productions that furnish abundant proofs of their learning and genius ; ,

CENT. XVII. genius; whereas, if we except a single work, published by the Jesuits of *Antwerp*, many years have passed since the sons of LOYOLA have given any satisfactory proofs of their boasted learning, or added to the *mass* of literature any work worthy to be compared with the *labours* of the followers of BENEDICT.

These learned monks excited the emulation of the *Priests of the oratory*, whose efforts to resemble them were far from being destitute of success. Several members of this latter Order distinguished themselves by their remarkable proficiency in various branches both of sacred and profane literature. This, to mention no more examples, appears sufficiently from the writings of MORIN, THOMASSIN, and SIMON, and from that admirable work of CHARLES DE COINTE, entitled, *The Ecclesiastical Annals of France*. The *Jansenists*, also, deserve a place in the list of those who cultivated letters with industry and success. Many of their productions abound with erudition, and several of them excel both in elegance of style and precision of method; and it may be said in general, that their writings were eminently serviceable in the instruction of youth, and also proper to contribute to the progress of learning among persons of riper years. The writings of those who composed the community of *Port-Royal* [p], the works of TILLEMONT, ARNAUD, NICOLE, PASCAL, and LANCELOT, with many other elegant and useful productions of persons of this class, were undoubtedly an ornament to French Literature during this century. The other religious societies, the higher and lower orders of the clergy, had also among them men of learning and genius that reflected a lustre upon the respective classes to which they belonged. Nor ought this to be a matter of admiration; since nothing is more natural than that, in an immense multitude of monks and clergy, all possessed of abundant leisure for study and of the best opportunities of improvement, there should be some who, unwilling to hide or throw away such a precious talent, would employ, with success, this leisure and these opportunities in the culture of the sciences. It is nevertheless certain, that the eminent men who were to be found beyond the limits of the four classes already mentioned [q], were few in number, comparatively speaking, and scarcely exceeded the list that any one of these classes was able to furnish.

The principal
authors of the
Romish commun-
ion.

XXXIII. Hence it comes, that the church of *Rome* can produce a long list of writers that have arisen in its bosom, and acquired a shining and permanent reputation by their learned productions. At the head of the eminent authors, which we find among the monastic Orders and the *regular* clergy, must be placed the cardinals BARONIUS and BELLARMIN, who have obtained an immortal name in their church, the one by his laborious *Annals*, and the other by his books of Controversy. The other writers, that belong

[p] *Messieurs de Port-Royal* was a general denomination, which comprehended all the Jansenist writers, but was however applied in a more confined and particular sense to those Jansenists, who passed their days in pious exercises and literary pursuits in the retreat of *Port-Royal*, a mansion situated at a little distance from *Paris*. It is well known that several writers of superior genius, extensive learning, and uncommon eloquence, resided in this sanctuary of letters.

[q] The Jesuits, Benedictines, Priests of the oratory, and Jansenists.

to this class, are SERRARIUS — FEVARDENTIUS — POSSEVIN — GRETSER CENT. XVII
 — COMBEFIS — NATALIS ALEXANDER — BECAN — SIRMOND — PETAU —
 POUSSINES — CELLOT — CAUSSIN — MORIN — RENAUD — FRA-PAOLO —
 PALLAVICINI — LABBE — MAIMBURG — THOMASSIN — SFONDRAT — AGUIR-
 RE — HENRY NORIS — D'ACHERY — MABILLON — HARDOUIN — SIMON —
 RUINART — MONTFAUCON — GALLONI — SCACCHI — CORNELIUS A LA-
 PIDE — BONFRERE — MENARD — SEGUENOT — BERNARD — LAMY — BOL-
 LAND — HENSCHEN — PAPEBROCH — and others.

The principal authors among the *secular clergy*, who are neither bound by vows nor attached to any peculiar community and rules of discipline, were PERRON — ESTIUS — LAUNOY — ALBASPINÆUS — PETRUS DE MARCA — RICHLIEU — HOLSTENIUS — BALUZE — BONA — HUET — BOSSUET — FENELON — GODEAU — TILLEMONT — THIERS — DU PIN — LEO ALLATIUS — ZACCAGNI — COTELIER — FILESAC — VISCONTI — &c [r]. This list might be considerably augmented by adding to it those writers, among the laity, who distinguished themselves by their theological or literary productions.

XXXIV. If we take an accurate view of the religious system of the Romish church, during this century, both with respect to articles of faith and rules of practice, we shall find that, instead of being improved by being brought somewhat nearer to that perfect model of doctrine and morals that is exhibited to us in the Holy Scriptures, it had contracted new degrees of corruption and degeneracy in most places, partly by the negligence of the Roman pontiffs, and partly by the dangerous maxims and influence of the Jesuits. This is not only the observation of those who have renounced the Romish communion and in the despotic style of that church are called *heretics*; it is the complaint of the wisest and worthiest part of that communion, of all its members, who have a zeal for the advancement of true Christian knowledge and genuine piety.

The doctrine of the church of Rome still more corrupt than in the preceding ages.

As to the *doctrinal* part of the Romish religion, it is said, and not without foundation, to have suffered extremely in the hands of the Jesuits, who, under the connivance, nay, sometimes, by the immediate assistance, of the Roman pontiffs, have perverted and corrupted such of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity as were left entire by the council of *Trent*. There are not wanting proofs sufficient to support this charge, inasmuch as these subtle and insidious fathers have manifestly endeavoured to diminish the authority and importance of the Holy Scriptures, have extolled the power of human nature, changed the sentiments of many with respect to the necessity and efficacy of divine grace, represented the mediation and sufferings of CHRIST as less powerful and meritorious than they are said to be in the sacred writings, turned the Roman pontif into a terrestrial Deity, and put him almost upon an equal footing with the Divine Saviour; and, finally, rendered, as far as in them lies, the truth of the Christian religion dubious, by their fallacious reasonings and their subtle but pernicious sophistry. The

[r] For a particular account of the respective merit of the writers here mentioned, see, among other literary historians, DU PIN's *Histoire des Ecrivains Ecclesiastiques*, tom. xvii, xviii, xix.

CENT. XVII.

testimonies brought to support these accusations by men of weight and merit, particularly among the Jansenists, are of very great authority, and it is extremely difficult to refuse our assent to them when they are impartially examined; but, on the other hand, it may be easily proved that the Jesuits, instead of inventing these pernicious doctrines, did no more, in reality, than propagate them as they found them in that ancient form of the Romish religion that preceded the reformation, and was directly calculated to raise the authority of the pope, and the power and prerogatives of the Romish church, to the very highest pitch of despotic grandeur. To inculcate this form of doctrine was the direct vocation of the Jesuits, who were to derive all their credit, opulence, and influence, from their being considered as the main support of the papacy, and the peculiar favorites of the Roman pontiffs. If the ultimate end and purpose of these pontiffs were to render the church more pure and holy, and to bring it as near as possible to the resemblance of its divine founder, and if this were the commission they give to their favorite emissaries and doctors, then the Jesuits would be at liberty to preach a very different doctrine from what they now inculcate. But that liberty cannot be granted to them as long as their principal orders, from the papal throne, are, to use all their diligence and industry, to the end that the pontiffs may hold what they have acquired, and recover what they have lost; and that the bishops and ministers of the Romish church may daily see their opulence increase, and the limits of their authority extended and enlarged. The chief crime then of the Jesuits is really this, that they have explained with more openness and perspicuity those points, which the leading managers in the council of *Trent* had either entirely omitted or slightly mentioned, that they might not shock the friends of true religion, who composed a part of that famous assembly. And here we see the true reason, why the Roman pontiffs, notwithstanding the ardent solicitations and remonstrances that have been employed to arm their just severity against the Jesuits, have always maintained that artful Order, and have been so deaf to the accusations of their adversaries, that no entreaties have been able to persuade them to condemn their religious principles and tenets, however erroneous in their nature and pernicious in their effects. On the contrary, the court of *Rome* has always opposed, either in a public or clandestine manner, all the vigorous measures that have been used to procure the condemnation and suppression of the doctrine of the *Loyolites*; and the Roman pontiffs have constantly treated all such attempts, as the projects of rash and imprudent men, who, through involuntary ignorance or obstinate prejudice, were blind to the true interests of the church.

The foundations
of morality sap-
ped by the Jesuits.

XXXV. In the sphere of morals the Jesuits made still more dreadful and atrocious inroads than in that of religion. Did we affirm, that they have perverted and corrupted almost all the various branches and precepts of morality, we should not express sufficiently the pernicious tendency of their maxims. Were we to go still further, and maintain that they have sapped and destroyed its very foundations, we should maintain no more than what innumerable writers of the Romish church abundantly testify, and what many

many of the most illustrious communities of that church publicly lament. CENT. XVII.
Those, who bring this dreadful charge against the sons of LOYOLA, have taken abundant precautions to vindicate themselves against the reproach of calumny in this matter. They have published several maxims, inconsistent with all regard for virtue and even decency, which they have drawn from the moral writings of that Order, and more especially from the numerous productions of its *Casuits*. They observe more particularly that the whole society adopts and inculcates the following maxims:

“That persons *truly wicked*, and *void of the love of God*, may expect to obtain *eternal life* in heaven, provided, that they be impressed with a fear of the Divine anger, and void of all heinous and enormous crimes *through the dread of future punishment*;

“That those persons may transgress, *with safety*, who have a *probable reason* for transgressing, *i. e.* any plausible argument or authority in favour of the sin they are inclined to commit [s]:

“That actions *intrinsically evil*, and directly *contrary to the divine laws*, may be *innocently* performed, by those, who have no such power over their own minds, as to join, even ideally, a *good end* to this *wicked action*, or (to speak in the style of the Jesuits) who are capable of *directing their intention aright* [t]:

“That *philosophical sin* is of a very light and trivial nature, and does not deserve the pains of hell.”—(By *philosophical sin* the Jesuits mean, *an action contrary to the dictates of nature and right reason* done by a person, who is

[s] This is one of the most corrupt and most dangerous maxims of the Jesuits. On the one hand, they have, among them, doctors of different characters and different principles, that thus they may render their society recommendable in the eyes of all sorts of persons, the licentious as well as the austere. On the other, they maintain, that an *opinion* or *practice*, recommended by any one doctor, becomes thereby *probable*, as it is not to be supposed, that a learned divine would adopt an opinion, or recommend a practice, in favour of which no considerable reason could be alledged.—But here lies the poison; this *probable* opinion or practice may be followed, say the Jesuits, even when the contrary is still *more probable*, nay, when it is *sure*, because though the man err, he errs under the authority of an eminent doctor. Thus ESCOBAR affirms, that a judge may decide in favour of that side of a question that is the least probable, and even against his own opinion, if he be supported by any tolerable authority. See *Lettres Provinciales*, lettre viii.]

[t] For example, an ecclesiastic, who buys a benefice, in order to *direct his intention aright*, must, by a powerful act of abstraction, turn away his thoughts from the crime of *simony*, which he is committing, to some lawful purpose, such as that of acquiring an ample subsistence, or that of doing good by instructing the ignorant. Thus again, a man who runs his neighbour through the body, in a duel, on account of a trivial affront, to render his action lawful, has only to turn his thoughts from the principle of vengeance to the more decent principle of honour, and the murder he commits, will, by the magic power of jesuitical morality, be converted into an innocent action. There is no crime, no enormity, to which this abominable maxim may not be extended. A famous Jesuit has declared, that a son may wish for the death of his father, and even rejoice at it when it arrives, provided, that this wish does not arise from any personal hatred, but only from a desire of the patrimony, which this death will procure him. See GASPARD HURTADO, *De sub. peccat.* diff. 9. quoted by DIANA, p. 5. tr. 14. R. 99. and another has had the effrontery to maintain, that a monk or ecclesiastic may lawfully assassinate a calumniator, who threatens laying scandalous crimes to the charge of their community, when there is no other way of hindering him to execute his purpose. See the works of Father L'AMY, tom. v. disp. 36. n. 118.]

CENT. XVII. ignorant of the written law of God, or doubtful [u] of its true meaning):

“ That the transgressions committed by a person, blinded by the seduction
“ of lust, agitated by the impulse of tumultuous passions, and destitute of all
“ sense and impression of religion, however detestable and heinous they may
“ be in themselves, are not imputable to the transgressor before the tribunal
“ of God; and that such transgressions may often be as involuntary as the
“ actions of a madman :

“ That the person who takes an oath, or enters into a contract, may, to
“ elude the force of the one and the obligation of the other, add to the form
“ of words, that express them, certain mental additions and tacit refer-
“ vations.”

These and other enormities of a like nature [w] are said to make an essential part of the system of morality inculcated by the Jesuits. And they

[(u) It would be perhaps more accurate to define the *philosophical sin* of the Jesuits to be, *an action contrary to right reason, which is done by a person, who is either absolutely ignorant of God, or does not think of him, during the time this action is committed.*]

[w] The books that have been written to expose and refute the corrupt and enormous maxims of the Jesuits would make an ample library were they collected together. But nothing of this kind is equal to the learned, ingenious and humorous work of the famous PASCAL, entitled, *Les Provinciales, ou Lettres, écrites par LOUIS DE MONTALTE à un Provincial de ses amis et aux Jésuites, sur la Morale et la Politique de ces Peres.* This exquisite production is accompanied, in some editions of it, with the learned and judicious observations of NICOLE, who, under the fictitious name of GUILLAUME WENDROCK, has fully demonstrated the truth of those facts which PASCAL had advanced without quoting his authorities, and has placed, in a full and striking light, several interesting circumstances, which that great man had treated with, perhaps, too much brevity. These *Letters*, which did the Jesuits more real mischief than either the indignation of sovereign princes, or any other calamity that had heretofore fallen upon their Order, were translated into Latin by RACHELIUS. On the other hand, the sons of LOYOLA, sensibly affected and alarmed by this formidable attack upon their reputation, left no means unemployed to defend themselves against such a respectable adversary. They sent forth their ablest champions to defend their cause, or at least to cover them from shame; among which champions the subtle and eloquent Father DANIEL, the celebrated author of the *History of France*, shone forth with a superior lustre. And, as if they thought it unsafe to trust to the powers of argument and the force of evidence alone, they applied themselves for help to the secular arm, and had credit enough to obtain a sentence against the *Provinciales*, by which they were condemned to be burnt publicly at Paris. See DANIEL's *Opuscles*, vol. i. p. 363. This author however acknowledges, that the greatest part of the answers which the Jesuits opposed to the performance of PASCAL were weak and unsatisfactory. Certain it is, that (whether it was owing to the strength of argument, or to the elegant wit and humour that reigned in them) the *Provincial Letters* lost not the smallest portion of their credit and reputation by all the answers that were made to them, but continued to pass through a variety of editions, which could scarcely be thrown off with rapidity sufficient to satisfy the desires of the public.

Another severe attack was made upon the Jesuits in a book, inferiour to PASCAL's in point of wit and genteel pleasantry, but superiour to it in point of evidence, since it abounds with passages and testimonies, which are drawn from the most applauded writings of the Jesuits, and demonstrate fully the corruption and enormity of the moral rules and maxims inculcated by that famous Order. This book, which was published at Mons, in three volumes, 8^{vo}. in the year 1702, bears the following title: *La Morale des Jésuites extraite fidelement de leurs Livres imprimés avec la permission et l'approbation des superieurs de leur Compagnie, par un Docteur de Sorbonne.* The author was PERRAULT (son of CHARLES PERRAULT, who began the famous controversy in France concerning the respective merit of the ancients and moderns) and his book met with the same fate with the *Provincials* of PASCAL; for it was burnt at Paris, in the year 1670, at the request of the Jesuits. See the *Opuscles du P. DANIEL*, tom. i. p. 356. Nor indeed is it at all

were

were complained of, in the strongest remonstrances, not only by the Dominicans and Jansenists, but also by the most eminent theological doctors of *Paris, Poitiers, Louvain*, and other academical cities, who expressed their abhorrence of them in such a public and solemn manner, that the Roman pontif neither thought it safe nor honourable to keep silence on that head. Accordingly a part of these moral maxims were condemned, in the year 1659, by pope ALEXANDER VII, in a public edict; and, in the year 1690, the article relating to *philosophical sin* met with the same fate, under the pontificate of ALEXANDER VIII [x]. It was but natural to think, that if the Order of Jesuits did not expire under the terrible blows it received from such a formidable list of adversaries, yet their system of morals must at least have been suppressed and their pestilential maxims banished from the schools. This is the least that could have been expected from the complaints and remonstrances of the clerical and monastic Orders, and the damnatory bulls of the Roman pontifs. And yet, if we may credit the testimonies of many learned and pious men in the communion of *Rome*, even this effect was not produced, and the remonstrances of the monks, the complaints of the clergy, and the bulls of the popes, rather served to restrain, in a certain measure, the enormous licentiousness, that had reigned among the writers of this corrupt Order, than to purify the seminaries of instruction from the contagion of their dissolute maxims. — After what has been observed in relation to the moral system of the Jesuits, it will not be difficult to assign a reason for the remarkable propensity that is discovered by kings, princes, the nobility, and gentry of both sexes, and an innumerable multitude of persons of all ranks and conditions, to commit their consciences to the direction and their souls to the care of the brethren of this society. It is, no doubt, highly convenient for persons, who do not pretend to a rigid observance of the duties of religion and morality, to have spiritual guides, who diminish the guilt of trans-

surprising, that the Jesuits exerted all their zeal against this compilation, which exhibited, in one shocking point of view, all that had been complained of and censured in their maxims and institutions, and unfolded the whole mystery of their iniquity.

It has been also laid to the charge of the Jesuits, that they reduced their pernicious maxims to practice, especially in the remoter parts of the world. This the famous ARNAULD, together with some of his Jansenist brethren, have undertaken to prove in that laborious and celebrated work, entitled, *La Morale Pratique des Jesuites*. In this important work, which consists of eight volumes, in 8^{vo}. and of which a second edition was published at *Amsterdam* in the year 1742, there is a multitude of authentic relations, documents, facts, and testimonies, employed to demonstrate the criminal conduct and practices of the Jesuits. — For an ample account of the jesuitical doctrine concerning *Philosophical Sin*, and the dissensions and controversies it occasioned, see JACOBI HYACINTHI SERRY *, *Addenda ad Histor. Congregationum de Auxiliis*, p. 82; as also his *Auctarium*, p. 289.

[x] There is a concise and accurate account of the contests and divisions, to which the morality of the Jesuits gave rise in *France* and in other places, in a work, entitled, *Catechisme Historique et Dogmatique sur les Contestations qui divisent maintenant l'Eglise*, published in the year 1730, see tom. ii. p. 26. — It is very remarkable, that the two papal bulls of ALEXANDER VII and VIII, against the Jesuits, are not to be found in the *Bullarium Pontificum*; but the Jansenists and Dominicans, who are careful in perpetuating whatever may tend to the dishonour of the Jesuits, have preserved them industriously from oblivion.

* This is a fictitious name; the true name of the author of the *Addenda* is AUGUSTIN LE BLANC.

CENT. XVII. gression, disguise the deformity of vice, let loose the reins to all the passions, may even nourish them by their dissolute precepts, and render the way to heaven as easy, as agreeable, and smooth as is possible [y].

What has here been said concerning the erroneous maxims and corrupt practices of the Jesuits must, however, be understood with certain modifications and restrictions. It must be imagined, that these maxims are adopted, or these practices justified, by all the sons of LOYOLA without exception, or that they are publicly taught and inculcated in all their schools and seminaries; for this, in reality, is not the case. As this Order has produced men of learning and genius, so neither has it been destitute of men of probity and candour; nor would it be a difficult task to compile from the writings of the Jesuits a much more just and proper representation of the duties of religion and the obligations of morality, than that hideous and unseemly exhibition of both, which PASCAL and his followers have drawn from the jesuitical *Casuists*, *Summists*, and *Moralists*. Those who censure the Jesuits in general, must, if their censures be well founded, have the following circumstances in view: *First*, That the rulers of that society not only suffer several of their members to propagate publicly impious opinions and corrupt maxims, but even go so far as to set the seal of their approbation to the books in which these opinions and maxims are contained [z]:—*Secondly*, That the system of religion and morality that is taught in the greatest part of their seminaries is so loose, vague, and ill-digested, that it not only may be easily *perverted* to bad purposes and erroneous conclusions, but even seems peculiarly *susceptible* of such abuse: and lastly, that the select few, who are initiated into the *grand mysteries* of the society, and set apart to transact its affairs, to carry on its projects, to exert their political talents in the closet of the minister, or in the cabinet of the prince, commonly make use of the dangerous and pernicious maxims that are complained of, to augment the authority and opulence of their Order. The candor and impartiality that become an historian oblige us to acknowledge, at the same time, that, in demonstrating the turpitude and enormity of certain maxims and opinions of the Jesuits, their adversaries have gone too far and permitted their eloquence and zeal to run into exaggeration. This we might shew, with the fullest evidence, by examples deduced from the doctrines of *probability* and *mental reservation*, and the imputations that have been made to the Jesuits on these heads; but this would lead us too far from the thread of our history. We shall only observe, that, what happens frequently in every kind of controversy, happened here in a singular manner; I mean, that the Jesuits were charged with tenets, which had been drawn *consequently* from their doctrine by their accusers without their consent;—that their phrases and terms were not always interpreted according to the precise

[(y)] The translator has here inserted into the text the note [q] in the original.]

[(z)] This is no doubt true. The Jesuits, as has been observed above, note [r], have doctors of all sorts and sizes; and this, indeed, is necessary in order to the establishment of that universal empire that they aim at. See *Lettres Provinciales*, lett. v. p. 62. dixieme edit. de Cologne 1689.]

meaning they annexed to them; — and that the tendency of their system was represented in too partial and unequitable a light. CENT. XVII.

XXXVI. The Holy Scriptures did not acquire any new degrees of public respect and authority under the pontiffs of this century. It can be proved, on the contrary, by the most authentic records, that the votaries of *Rome*, and more especially the Jesuits, employed all their dexterity and art either to prevent the word of God from falling into the hands of the people, or at least to have it explained in a manner consistent with the interest, grandeur, and pretensions of the church. In *France* and in the *Low Countries* there arose, indeed, several commentators and critics, who were very far from being destitute of knowledge and erudition; but it may nevertheless be said concerning them, that, instead of illustrating and explaining the divine oracles, they rendered them more obscure by blending their own crude inventions with the dictates of celestial wisdom. This is chargeable even upon the Jansenists, who, though superior to the other Roman-catholic expositors in most respects, yet fell into that absurd method of disfiguring the pure word of God by far-fetched allusions, mystic interpretations, and frigid allegories compiled from the reveries of the ancient fathers [a]. Here, nevertheless, an exception is to be made in favour of PASQUIER QUENEL, a priest of the oratory, whose edition of the *New Testament*, accompanied with pious meditations and remarks, made such a prodigious noise in the theological world [b], and even in our time has continued to furnish matter of warm and violent contest, and to split the Roman-catholic doctors into parties and factions [c].

The state of Exegetic theology, or the progress made in the interpretation and exposition of scripture.

XXXVII. The greatest part of the public schools retained that dry, intricate, and captious method of teaching theology, that had prevailed in the ages of barbarism and darkness, and was adapted to disgust all such as were endowed with a liberal turn of mind. There was no possibility of ordering matters so, as that *Didactic* or *Biblical theology*, which is supposed to arrange and illustrate the truths of irreligion by the dictates of Holy Scripture,

Of Didactic, Moral, and Polemic theology.

[a] The reader will find a striking example of this in the well-known *Bible* of ISAAC LE MAÎTRE, commonly called SACY, which contains all the crude and extravagant fancies and allegories, with which the ancient doctors obscured the beautiful simplicity of the Holy Scriptures, and rendered their clearest expressions intricate and mysterious.

[(b) That is, in the Roman-catholic part of the theological world.—Never perhaps did any thing shew, in a more striking manner, the blind zeal of faction than the hard treatment this book met with. RENAUDOT, a very learned French abbot, who resided some time at *Rome* during the pontificate of CLEMENT XI, went one day to visit that pontiff, who was a patron of learned men, and found him reading QUENEL'S Bible. On the abbot's entering the chamber, the pope accosted him thus: *Here is an admirable book! We have no body at Rome capable of writing in this manner. I would be glad if I could engage the author of it to reside here.*—The very same pope that pronounced this encomium on QUENEL'S book, condemned it publicly afterwards, and employed all his authority to suppress it. See VOLTAIRE, *Siecle de Louis XIV*, vol. ii. p. 293. *Edit. de Dresde* 1753.]

[c] The first part of this work, which contains *Observations* on the four Gospels, was published in the year 1671; and as it was received with universal applause, this encouraged the author, not only to revise and augment it, but also to enlarge his plan and compose *Observations* on the other books of the New Testament. See *Catechisme Historique sur les Contestations de l'Eglise*, tom. ii. p. 150.—CH. EBERH. WEISMANNI *Histor. Eccles. Sæc. xvii.* p. 588.

should

CENT. XVII.

should be placed upon the same footing and held in the same honour with *scholastic divinity*, which had its source in the metaphysical visions of the peripatetic philosophy. Even the edicts of the pontiffs were insufficient to bring this about. In the greatest part of the universities the *scholastic* doctors domineered, and were constantly molesting and insulting the *Biblical* divines, who, generally speaking, were little skilled in the captious arts of sophistry and dialectical chicanery. It is nevertheless to be observed, that many of the French doctors, and more especially the Jansenists, explained the principal doctrines and duties of Christianity in a style and manner that were at least commendable on account of their elegance and perspicuity; and indeed it may be affirmed, that almost all the theological or moral treatises of this age, that were composed with any tolerable degree of simplicity and good sense, had the doctors of *Port-Royal*, or the French priests of the oratory, for their authors. We have already taken notice of the changes that were introduced, during this century, into the method of carrying on theological controversy. The Germans, Belgic, and French divines being at length convinced, by a disagreeable experience, that their captious, incoherent, and uncharitable manner of disputing, exasperated those who differed from them in their religious sentiments, and confirmed them in their respective systems instead of converting them; and perceiving moreover, that the arguments in which they had formerly placed their principal confidence proved feeble and insufficient to make the least impression, found it necessary to look out for new and more specious methods of attack and defence.

The contests that arose under the pontificate of Clement VIII, between the Jesuits and Dominicans concerning the Divine Grace.

XXXVIII. The Romish church has, notwithstanding its boasted uniformity of doctrine, been always divided by a multitude of controversies. It would be endless to enumerate the disputes that have arisen between the seminaries of learning and the contests that have divided the monastic Orders. The greatest part of these, as being of little moment, we shall pass over in silence; for they have been treated with indifference and neglect by the popes, who never took notice of them but when they grow violent and noisy, and then suppressed them with an imperious nod that imposed silence upon the contending parties. Besides; these less momentous controversies, which it will ever be impossible entirely to extinguish, are not of such a nature as to affect the church in its fundamental principles, to endanger its constitution or to hurt its interests. It will, therefore, be sufficient to give a brief account of those debates, that, by their superior importance and their various connexions and dependencies, may be said to have affected the church in general, and to have threatened it with alarming changes and revolutions.

And here the first place is, naturally, due to those famous debates that were carried on between the *Jesuits* and *Dominicans*, concerning *the nature and necessity of Divine Grace*; the decision of which important point had, towards the conclusion of the preceding century, been committed by CLEMENT VIII to a select assembly of learned divines. These arbiters, after having employed several years in deliberating upon this nice and critical subject, and in examining the arguments of the contending parties, intimated,
plainly

plainly enough, to the pontif, that the sentiments of the Dominicans concerning *Grace, Predestination, Human Liberty*, and *Original Sin*, were more conformable to the doctrine of scripture and the decisions of the ancient fathers than the opinions of MOLINA, which were patronised by the Jesuits. They observed, more especially, that the former leaned towards the tenets of AUGUSTIN; while the latter bore a striking resemblance of the Pelagian heresy. In consequence of this declaration CLEMENT seemed resolved to pass condemnation on the Jesuits, and to determine the controversy in favour of the Dominicans. Things were in this state in the year 1601, when the Jesuits, alarmed at the dangers that threatened them, beset the old pontif night and day, and so importuned him with entreaties, menaces, arguments, and complaints, that, in the year 1602, he consented to re-examine this intricate controversy, and undertook himself the critical task of principal arbitrator therein. For this purpose he chose a council [d] (composed of fifteen cardinals, nine professors of divinity, and five bishops) which, during the space of three years [e], assembled seventy-eight times, or, to speak in the style of *Rome*, held so many *congregations*. At these meetings the pontif heard, at one time the Jesuits and Dominicans disputing in favour of their respective systems, and ordered, at another, the assembled doctors to weigh their reasons, and examine the proofs that were offered on both sides of this difficult question. The result of this examination is not known with any degree of certainty; since the death of CLEMENT, which happened on the fourth day of March, in the year 1605, prevented his pronouncing a decisive sentence. The Dominicans assure us that the pope, had he lived, would have condemned MOLINA. The Jesuits, on the contrary maintain, that he would have acquitted him publicly from all charge of heresy and error. They alone, who have seen the records of this council, and the journal of its proceedings, are qualified to determine which of the two we are to believe; but these records are kept with the utmost secrecy at *Rome*.

XXXIX. The proceedings of the *congregation* that had been assembled by CLEMENT were suspended, for some time, by the death of that pontif; but they were resumed, in the year 1605, by the order of PAUL V, his successor. Their deliberations, which were continued from the month of September, till the month of March of the following year, did not turn so much upon the merits of the cause, which were already sufficiently examined, as upon the prudent and proper method of finishing the contest. The great question now was, whether the well-being of the church would admit of the decision of this controversy by a papal bull; and, if such a decision was found adviseable, it still remained to be considered, in what terms the bull should be drawn up. All these long and solemn deliberations resembled the delivery of the mountain in the fable, and ended in this resolution, that the whole controversy, instead of being *decided*, should be *suppressed*, and

Continuation of
this controversy,
under Paul V.
and its issue.

[d] This council was called the *Congregation de Auxiliis*.

[e] From the 20th of March 1602, to the 22^d of January 1605.

that

that each of the contending parties should have the liberty of following their respective opinions. The Dominicans assert, that the two pontifs, together with the *congregation* of divines that they employed in the review of this important controversy, were entirely persuaded of the justice of *their* cause, and of the truth of *their* system; they moreover observe, that PAUL V had expressly ordered a solemn condemnation of the doctrine of the Jesuits to be drawn up, but was prevented from finishing and publishing it to the world by the unhappy war, that was kindled about that time between him and the Venetians. The Jesuits, on the other hand, represent these accounts of the Dominicans as entirely fictitious, and affirm that neither the pontif, nor the more judicious and respectable members of the *congregation*, found any thing in the sentiments of MOLINA that was worthy of censure, or stood in much need of correction. In a point which is rendered thus uncertain by contradictory testimonies and assertions, it is difficult to determine what we are to believe; it however appears extremely probable, that, whatever the private opinion of PAUL V may have been, he was prevented from pronouncing a public determination of this famous controversy by his apprehensions of offending either the king of *France*, who protected the Jesuits, or the king of *Spain*, who warmly maintained the cause of the Dominicans. It is further probable, nay almost certain, that, had the pontif been independent on all foreign influence and at full liberty to decide this knotty point, he would have pronounced one of those *ambiguous* sentences, for which the oracle of *Rome* is so famous, and would have so conducted matters as to shock neither of the contending parties [f].

[f] Besides the authors we have above recommended as proper to be consulted in relation to these contests, see LE CLERC, *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire des controverses dans l'Eglise Romaine sur la Predestination et sur la Grace*, in his *Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique*, tom. xiv. p. 235. —The conduct, both of the Jesuits and Dominicans, after their controversy was hushed in silence, affords much reason to presume, that they had been both secretly exhorted by the Roman pontif to mitigate somewhat their respective systems, and so to modify their doctrines or expressions, as to avoid the reproaches of heresy that had been cast upon them; for the Jesuits were accused of Pelagianism, and the Dominicans were charged with a propensity to the tenets of the Protestant churches. This appears, in a more particular manner, from a letter written by CLAUDIUS AQUAVIVA, general of the Jesuits, in the year 1613, and addressed to all the members of his Order. In this letter the prudent general modifies with great dexterity and caution the sentiments of MOLINA, and enjoins it upon the brethren of the society to teach every where the doctrine which represents the supreme Being, *as electing, freely, to eternal life, without any regard had to their merits, those whom he has been pleased to render partakers of that inestimable blessing*; but, at the same time, he exhorts them to inculcate this doctrine in such a manner, as not to give up the tenets, relating to Divine Grace, which they had maintained in their controversy with the Dominicans. Never, surely, was such a contradictory exhortation or order heard of; the good general thought, nevertheless, that he could reconcile abundantly these contradictions, by that branch of the divine knowledge which is called, by the schoolmen, *scientia media*. See the *Catechisme Historique sur les dissensions de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 207.

On the other hand, the Dominicans, although their sentiments remain the same that they were before the commencement of this controversy, have learned, notwithstanding, to cast a kind of ambiguity and obscurity over their theological system, by using certain terms and expressions, that are manifestly borrowed from the schools of the Jesuits; and this they do to prevent the latter from reproaching them with a propensity to the doctrine of CALVIN. They are, moreover, much less remarkable, than formerly, for their zealous opposition to the Jesuits, which may be owing, per-

XL. The flame of controversy, which seemed thus extinguished, or at least covered, broke out again with new violence, in the year 1640, and formed a kind of schism in the church of *Rome*, which involved it in great perplexity, and proved highly detrimental to it in various respects. The occasion of these new troubles was the publication of a book, entitled, *AUGUSTINUS*, composed by CORNELIUS JANSENIUS, bishop of *Ypres*, and published after the death of its author [g]. In this book, which even the Jesuits acknowledge to be the production of a man of learning and piety, the doctrine of *AUGUSTIN* concerning man's *natural corruption* and the *nature and efficacy* of that *Divine Grace*, which alone can efface this unhappy stain, is unfolded at large and illustrated, for the most part, in *AUGUSTIN*'s own words. For the end, which JANSENIUS proposed to himself in this work, was not to give his own private sentiments concerning these important points, but to shew in what manner they had been understood and explained by that celebrated father of the church, now mentioned, whose name and *authority* were universally revered in all parts of the Roman-catholic world [h]. No incident could be more unfavourable to the cause of the Jesuits, and the progress of their religious system; for as the doctrine of

CENT. XVII.

The rise of Jansenism, and the contests it produced.

haps, to prudent reflexions on the dangers they have been involved in by this opposition, and the fruitless pains and labour it has cost them. The *Jansenists* reproach them severely with this change of conduct, and consider it as a manifest and notorious apostacy from divine truth. See the *Lettres Provinciales* of PASCAL, lettr. ii. p. 27. Edit. de Cologne, &c. 1689.—We are not, however, to conclude, from this change of style and external conduct among the Dominicans, that they are reconciled to the Jesuits, and that there remain no traces of their ancient opposition to that perfidious Order. By no means; for besides, that many of them are shocked at the excessive timidity and prudence of a great part of their brethren, the whole body retains still some hidden sparks of the indignation with which they formerly beheld the Jesuits; and, when a convenient occasion of discovering this indignation is offered, they do not let it pass unimproved. The *Jansenists* are here embarked in the same cause with the Dominicans; since the sentiments of St. THOMAS, concerning *Divine Grace*, differ but very little from those of St. AUGUSTIN. Cardinal HENRY NORIS, the most eminently learned among the followers of the latter, expresses his concern, that he is not at liberty to publish what passed in favour of *AUGUSTIN*, and to the disadvantage of *MOLINA* and the Jesuits, in the famous Congregation de *Auxiliis*, so often assembled by the Popes CLEMENT VIII and PAUL V; see his *Vindiciæ Augustinianæ*, cap. vi. p. 1175. tom. i. opp.—*Quando*, says he, *recentiori Romano decreto id vetitum est, cum dispendio causæ, quam defendo, necessariam defensionem omitto.*

[g] For an account of this famous man, see BAYLE's *Dictionary*, tom. ii. at the article JANSENIUS.—LEYDECKER, *De vita et morte JANSENI*, lib. iii. which makes the first part of his *History of Jansenism*, published at *Utrecht* in 8^{vo}. in the year 1695.—*Dictionnaire des Livres Jansenistes*, tom. i. p. 120.—This celebrated work of JANSENIUS, which gave such a wound to the Romish church, as neither the power nor wisdom of its pontiffs will ever be able to heal, is divided into three parts. The *first* is historical, and contains a relation of the Pelagian controversy which arose in the fifth century. In the *second* we find an accurate account and illustration of the doctrine of *AUGUSTIN*, relating to the *Constitution and powers of the Human Nature in its original, fallen, and renewed state*. The *third* contains the doctrine of the same great man, relating to the *Aids of sanctifying Grace procured by Christ, and to the eternal Predestination of men and angels*. The style of JANSENIUS is clear, but not sufficiently correct.

[h] Thus JANSENIUS expresses himself in his *Augustinus*, tom. ii. *Lib. Proæmial. cap. xxix. p. 65.*—*Non ego hic de aliqua nova sententia reperienda disputo . . . sed de antiqua Augustini.*—*Queritur, non quid de naturæ humanæ statibus et viribus, vel de Dei gratia et prædestinatione sentiendum est, sed quid Augustinus olim ecclesiæ nomine et applausu tradiderit, prædicaverit, scriptoque multipliciter consignaverit.*

CENT. XVII. AUGUSTIN differed but very little from that of the Dominicans [i]; as it was held sacred, nay almost respected as divine, in the church of *Rome*, on account of the extraordinary merit and authority of that illustrious bishop, and, at the same time, was almost diametrically opposite to the sentiments generally received among the Jesuits; these latter could scarcely consider the book of JANSENIUS in any other light than as a tacit, but formidable refutation of their opinions concerning *Human Liberty* and *Divine Grace*. And, accordingly, they not only drew their pens against this famous book, but also used their most zealous endeavours to obtain a public condemnation of it from *Rome*. Their endeavours were not unsuccessful. The Roman inquisitors began the opposition by prohibiting the perusal of it, in the year 1641; and the year following, URBAN VIII condemned it by a solemn bull, as infected with several errors, that had been long banished from the church.

XLI. There were nevertheless places, even within the bounds of the Romish church, where neither the decisions of the inquisitor, nor the bull of the pontif were, in the least, respected. The doctors of *Louvain*, in particular, and the followers of AUGUSTIN, in general, who were very numerous in the *Netherlands*, opposed, with the utmost vigour, the proceedings of the Jesuits, and the condemnation of JANSENIUS; and hence arose a warm contest which proved a source of much trouble to the Belgic provinces. But it was not confined within such narrow limits; it reached the neighbouring countries, and broke out, with peculiar vehemence, in *France*, where the abbot of *St. Cyran* [k], a man of an elegant genius, and equally distinguished by the extent of his learning, the lustre of his piety, and the sanctity of his manners, had procured AUGUSTIN many zealous followers, and the Jesuits as many bitter and implacable adversaries [l]. This respectable abbot was the intimate friend and relation of JANSENIUS, and one of the most strenuous defenders of his doctrine. On the other hand, the far greatest part of the French theologists appeared on the side of the Jesuits, whose religious tenets seemed more honourable to human nature, or at least more agreeable to its propensities, more suitable to the genius of

[i] The Dominicans followed the sentiments of THOMAS AQUINAS, concerning the nature and efficacy of Divine Grace.

[k] The name of this abbot was JEAN DU VERGER DE HAURANE.

[l] This illustrious abbot is considered by the Jansenists as equal in merit and authority to JANSENIUS himself, whom he is supposed to have assisted in composing his *Augustinus*. The French, more especially (I mean, such of them as adopt the doctrine of AUGUSTIN) revere him as an oracle, and even extol him beyond JANSENIUS. For an account of the life and transactions of this pious abbot, see LANCELOT'S *Memoires touchant la vie de M. de S. Cyran*, which were published at *Cologne* *, in the year 1738, in two volumes, 8^{vo}.—Add to these, *Recueil de plusieurs pieces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, p. 1—150.—ARNAUD D'ANDILLY, *Memoires au sujet de l'Abbé de S. Cyran*, which are published in the first volume of his *Vies des Religieuses de Port-Royal*, p. 15—44.—BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, vol. ii. at the article JANSENIUS.—*Dictionnaire des Livres Jansenistes*, tom. i. p. 133.—For an account of the earlier studies of the abbot in question, see GABRIEL LIRON, *Singularités Historiques et Littéraires*, tom. iv. p. 507.

* Though they are said, in the title-page, to have been printed at *Cologne*; yet it is presumed, on good grounds, that they first saw the light at *Utrecht*.

the Romish religion, and more adapted to promote and advance the interests of the Romish church, than the doctrine of AUGUSTIN. The party of Jansenius had also its patrons; and they were such as reflected honour on the cause. In this respectable list we may reckon several bishops eminent for their piety, and some of the first and most elegant geniuses of the French nation, such as ARNAULD, NICOLE, PASCAL, and QUENEL, and the other famous and learned men, who are known under the denomination of the *Authors of Port-Royal*. This party was also considerably augmented by a multitude of persons, who looked upon the usual practice of piety in the Romish church (which consists in the frequent use of the sacraments, the confession of sins, and the performance of certain external arts of religion) as much inferior to what the Gospel of CHRIST requires, and who considered Christian piety as the vital and internal principle of a soul, in which true faith and divine love have gained a happy ascendant. Thus one of the contending parties excelled in the number and power of its votaries; the other in the learning, genius, and piety of its adherents; and, things being thus ballanced, it is not difficult to comprehend, how a controversy, which began about a century ago, should be still carried on with the most vehement contention and ardour [m].

XLII. Those, who have taken an attentive view of this long and indeed endless controversy, cannot but think it a matter both of curiosity and amusement to observe the contrivances, stratagems, arguments, and arts employed by both *Jesuits* and *Jansenists*, by the former in their methods of attack; and by the latter in their plans of defence. The *Jesuits* came forth into the field of controversy armed with sophistical arguments, odious comparisons, papal bulls, royal edicts, and the protection of a great part of the nobility and bishops; and, as if all this had appeared to them insufficient, they had recourse to still more formidable auxiliaries, even the secular arm, and a competent number of dragoons. The *Jansenists*, far from being dismayed at the view of this warlike host, stood their ground with steadfastness and intrepidity. They evaded the mortal blows that were levelled at them in the royal and papal mandates, by the help of nice interpretations, subtle distinctions, nay, by the very same sophistical refinements which they blamed in the *Jesuits*. To the threatenings and frowns of the nobles and bishops,

The methods and arguments employed by both parties in this controversy.

[m] The history of this contest is to be found in many authors, who have either given a relation of the whole, or treated apart some of its most interesting branches. The writers that ought to be principally consulted on this subject are those which follow: GERBERON, *Histoire Generale du Jansenisme*, published in 1700, at Amsterdam, in three volumes, 8^{vo}. and republished in five volumes, 12^{mo} at Lyons, in 1708.—DU MAS, *Histoire des Cinq Propositions de JANSENIUS*, printed at Liege in 8^{vo} in 1694. Of these two writers, the former maintains the cause of the *Jansenists*; while the latter favours that of the *Jesuits*.—Add to these, MELCH. LEYDECKER's *Historia Jansenisme*, printed at Utrecht in 8^{vo} in 1695; and VOLTAIRE's *Siecle de Louis XIV*, tom. ii. p. 264. Several books, written on both sides, are enumerated in a work published in 8^{vo} in 1735, under the following title: *Bibliothèque Janseniste, ou Catalogue Alphabetique des principaux Livres Jansenistes*, the author of which is said to be DOMIN. COLONIA, a learned Jesuit. This book, as we have had before occasion to observe, has been republished at Antwerp, with considerable additions, in four volumes, 8^{vo}. under the title of, *Dictionnaire des Livres Jansenistes*.—See *Recueil des pieces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, p. 325.

CENT. XVII. who protected their adversaries, they opposed the favour and applause of the people; to sophisms they opposed sophisms, and invectives to invectives; and to human power they opposed the divine omnipotence, and boasted of the miracles by which heaven had declared itself in their favour. When they perceived that the strongest arguments and the most respectable authorities were insufficient to conquer the obstinacy of their adversaries, they endeavoured, by their religious exploits, and their application to the advancement of piety and learning, to obtain the favour of the pontifs, and strengthen their interest with the people. Hence they declared war against the enemies of the Romish church; formed new stratagems to ensnare and ruin the Protestants; took extraordinary pains in instructing the youth in all the liberal arts and sciences; drew up a variety of useful, accurate, and elegant abridgments, containing the elements of philosophy and the learned languages; published a multitude of treatises on practical religion and morality, whose persuasive eloquence charmed all ranks and orders of men; introduced and cultivated an easy, correct, and agreeable manner of writing; and gave accurate and learned interpretations of several ancient authors. To all these various kinds of merit, the greatest part of which were real and solid, they added others that were at least visionary and chimerical; for they endeavoured to persuade, and did, in effect, persuade many, that the supreme Being interposed particularly in support of their cause, and, by prodigies and miracles of a stupendous kind, confirmed the truth of the doctrine of AUGUSTIN, in a manner adapted to remove all doubt, and triumph over all opposition [n]. All this rendered the Jansenists extremely popular;

[n] It is well known that the *Jansenists*, or *Augustinians*, have long pretended to confirm their doctrine by miracles; and they even acknowledge, that these miracles have sometimes saved them, when their affairs have been reduced to a desperate situation. See *Memoires de Port-Royal*, tom. i. p. 256. tom. ii. p. 107.—The first time we hear mention made of these miracles is in 1656, and the following years, when a pretended thorn of that derisive crown, that was put upon our SAVIOUR'S head by the Roman soldiers, is reported to have performed several marvellous cures in the convent of *Port-Royal*. See the *Recueil de plusieurs pieces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, p. 228. 448.—FONTAINE, *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, tom. ii. p. 131.—These were followed by other prodigies in the year 1661.—*Vies des Religieuses de Port-Royal*, tom. i. p. 192. and in the year 1664, *Memoires de Port-Royal*, tom. iii. p. 252.—The fame of these miracles was very great during the last century, and proved singularly advantageous to the cause of the Jansenists; but they are now fallen, even in *France*, into oblivion and discredit. The *Jansenists*, therefore, of the present age, being pressed by their adversaries, were obliged to have recourse to new prodigies, as the credit of the old ones was entirely worn out; and they seemed, indeed, to have had miracles at command, by the considerable number they pretended to perform. Thus (if we are credulous enough to believe their reports) in the year 1725, a woman, whose name was LA FOSSE, was suddenly cured of a bloody flux by imploring the aid of the *Hosp*, when it was, one day, carried by a *Jansenist* priest. About two years after this, we are told, that the tomb of GERHARD ROUSSE, a canon of *Avignon*, was honoured with miracles of a stupendous kind; and, finally, we are informed that the same honour was conferred, in the year 1731, on the bones of the Abbé DE PARIS, which were interred at *St. Medard*, where innumerable miracles are said to have been wrought. This last story has given rise to the warmest contests, between the superstitious or crafty Jansenists and their adversaries in all communions. Besides all this, QUESNELL, LEVIER, DESANGINS, and TOURNUS, the great ornaments of Jansenism, are said to have furnished extraordinary succours, on several occasions, to sick and infirm persons, who testified a lively confidence in their prayers and merits. See a famous Jansenist-book composed in answer to the *Bull*

and

and held the victory of the Jesuits for some time dubious; nay, it is more than probable, that the former would have triumphed, had not the cause of the latter been the cause of the papacy, and had not the stability and grandeur of the Romish church depended, in a great measure, upon the success of their religious maxims.

XLIII. It appears, from several circumstances, that URBAN VIII, and, after him, INNOCENT X were really bent on appeasing these dangerous tumults, in the same manner as the popes in former times had prudently suppressed the controversies excited by BAIUS and the Dominicans. But the vivacity, inconstancy, and restless spirit of the French doctors threw all into confusion, and disconcerted the measures of the pontifs. The opposers of the doctrine of AUGUSTIN selected *five propositions* out the work of JANSENIUS already mentioned, which appeared to them the most erroneous in their nature and the most pernicious in their tendency; and, being set on by the instigation, and seconded by the influence, of the Jesuits, employed their most zealous endeavours and their most importunate entreaties, at the court of *Rome*, to have these propositions condemned. On the other hand, a great part of the Gallican clergy used their utmost efforts to prevent this condemnation; and, for that purpose, they sent deputies to *Rome* to entreat INNOCENT X to suspend his final decision until the *true* sense of these propositions was deliberately examined, since the ambiguity of style, in which they were expressed, rendered them susceptible of a false interpretation. But these entreaties were ineffectual: the interest and importunities of the Jesuits prevailed; and the pontif, without examining the merits of the cause with a suitable degree of impartiality and attention, condemned, by a public bull, on the 31st of May, 1653, with inexcusable temerity, the propositions of JANSENIUS. These propositions contained the following doctrines:

Five propositions of Jansenius condemned by Innocent X.

1. That *there are divine precepts, which good men, notwithstanding their desire to observe them, are, nevertheless, absolutely unable to obey; nor has God given them that measure of grace, that is essentially necessary to render them capable of such obedience:*

Unigenitus, and entitled, *Jesus Christ sous l'Anatheme et sous l'Excommunication*, art. xvii. p. 61. xviii. p. 66. *Edit. Utrecht*.—There is no doubt, but a great part of the Jansenists defend these miracles from principle, and in consequence of a persuasion of their truth and reality; for that party abounds with persons, whose piety is blended with a most superstitious credulity, who look upon their religious system as celestial truth, and their cause as the immediate cause of heaven, and, who are, consequently, disposed to think that it cannot possibly be neglected by the Deity, or left without extraordinary marks of his approbation and supporting presence. It is however amazing, nay almost incredible, on the other hand, that the more judicious defenders of this cause, those eminent Jansenists, whose sagacity, learning, and good sense discover themselves so abundantly in other matters, do not consider that the powers of nature, the efficacy of proper remedies, or the efforts of imagination, produce many important changes and effects, which imposture, or a blind attachment to some particular cause, lead many to attribute to the miraculous interposition of the Deity. We can easily account for the delusions of weak enthusiasts, or the tricks of egregious impostors; but when we see men of piety and judgment appearing in defence of such miracles as those now under consideration, we must conclude, that they look upon fraud as lawful in the support of a good cause, and make no scruple of deceiving the people, when they propose, by this delusion, to confirm and propagate what they take to be the truth.

2. That

CENT. XVII.

2. That no person, in this corrupt state of nature, can resist the influence of divine grace, when it operates upon the mind:

3. That, in order to render human actions meritorious, it is not requisite that they be exempt from NECESSITY, but, only, that they be free from CONSTRAINT [o]:

4. That the Semi-pelagians err grievously in maintaining, that the human will is endowed with the power of either receiving or resisting the aids and influences of preventing grace:

5. That whosoever affirms, that Jesus Christ made expiation, by his sufferings and death, for the sins of all mankind, is a Semi-pelagian.

Of these propositions the pontif declared the first four only heretical; but he pronounced the Fifth rash, impious, and injurious to the supreme Being [p].

Alexander VII
publishes a bull
against Janse-
nius.

XLIV. This sentence of the supreme ecclesiastical judge, was indeed painful to the Jansenists, and of consequence highly agreeable to their adversaries. It did not however either drive the former to despair, or satisfy the latter to the extent of their desires; for while the doctrine was condemned, the man escaped. JANSENIUS was not named in the bull, nor did the pontif even declare that the five propositions were maintained in the book, entitled, AUGUSTINUS, in the sense, in which he had condemned them. Hence the disciples of AUGUSTIN and JANSENIUS defended themselves by a distinction invented by the ingenious and subtle ANTHONY ARNAUD, in consequence of which they considered separately in this controversy the matter of doctrine and the matter of fact; that is to say, they acknowledged themselves bound to believe, that the five propositions above-mentioned were justly condemned by the Roman pontif [q]; but they maintained, that the pope had not declared, and consequently that they were not bound to believe, that these propositions were to be found in JANSENIUS's book in the sense, in which they had been condemned [r]: They did not however enjoy long the benefit of this artful distinction. The restless and invincible hatred of their enemies pursued them in every quarter, where they looked for protection or repose; and at length engaged ALEXANDER VII, the successor of INNOCENT, to declare, by a solemn bull, issued out in the year 1656, that the five propositions, that had been condemned, were the tenets of JANSENIUS, and were contained in his book. The pontif did not stop here; but to this flagrant instance of imprudence added another still more shocking; for, in the year 1665, he sent into France the form of a declaration, that was to be subscribed by all those, who aspired after any preferment in the church, and in which it was affirmed, that the five propositions were to be found in the book of

[(o) AUGUSTIN, LEIBNITZ, and a considerable number of modern philosophers, who maintain the doctrine of NECESSITY, consider this necessity in moral actions, as consistent with true liberty, because it is consistent with spontaneity and choice. According to them, constraint alone and external force destroy merit and imputation.]

[p] This Bull is still extant in the Bullarium Romanum, tom. vi. p. 456. It has also been published, together with several other pieces relating to this controversy, by DU PLESSIS D'ARCENTRE, in his Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 261.

[(q) This was what our author calls the *quæstio de jure*.]

[(r) This is the *quæstio de facto*.]

JANSENIUS,

JANSENIUS, in the same sense in which they had been condemned by the church [s]. This declaration, whose unexampled temerity and contentious tendency appeared in the most odious colours, not only to the Jansenists, but also to the wiser part of the French nation, produced the most deplorable divisions and tumults. It was immediately opposed with vigour by the Jansenists, who maintained, that, in *matters of fact*, the pope was *fallible*, especially when his decisions were merely personal, and not confirmed by a general council, and, of consequence, that it was neither obligatory nor necessary to subscribe this papal declaration, which had only a matter of fact for its object. The Jesuits, on the contrary, audaciously asserted, even publicly in the city of *Paris*, and in the face of the Gallican church, that faith and confidence in the papal decisions relating to matter of *fact*, had no less the characters of a well-grounded and *divine faith*, than when these decisions related merely to matters of doctrine and opinion. It is to be remarked, on the other hand, that all the Jansenists were, by no means, so resolute and intrepid as those above-mentioned. Some of them declared, that they would neither subscribe nor reject the *Form* in question, but shew their veneration for the authority of the pope, by observing a profound silence on that subject. Others professed themselves ready to subscribe it, not indeed without exception or reserve, but on condition of being allowed to explain, either verbally or in writing, the sense in which they understood it, or the distinctions and limitations with which they were willing to adopt it. Others employed a variety of methods and stratagems to elude the force of this tyrannical *declaration* [t]. But nothing of this kind was sufficient to satisfy the violent demands of the Jesuits; nothing less than the entire ruin of the Jansenists could appease their fury. Such therefore among the latter, as made the least opposition to the declaration in question, were cast into prison, or sent into exile, or involved in some other species of persecution; and it is well known that this severity was a consequence of the suggestions of the Jesuits, and of their influence in cabinet-councils.

XLV. The lenity or prudence of CLEMENT IX suspended, for a while, the calamities of those, who had sacrificed their liberty and their fortunes to their zeal for the doctrine of AUGUSTIN, and gave them both time to breathe, and reason to hope for better days. This change, which happened in the year 1669, was occasioned by the fortitude and resolution of the bishops of *Angers*, *Beauvais*, *Pamiers*, and *Alet*, who obstinately and gloriously refused to subscribe, without the proper explications and distinctions, the oath or declaration that had produced such troubles and divisions in the church. They did not, indeed, stand alone in the breach; for when the court of *Rome* began to menace and level its thunder at their heads, nineteen bishops more arose with a noble intrepidity, and adopted their cause, in

This persecution is suspended under the pontificate of Clement IX.—This suspension commonly called the Peace of Clement.

[s] This *Bull*, together with several other pieces, is also published by DU PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, in his *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 281. 288. 306.—See the form of ALEXANDER's declaration, with the *Mandate* of LEWIS XIV, *ibid.* p. 314.

[t] See DU MAS, *Histoire des Cinq Propositions*, p. 158.—GERBERON, *Histoire Generale du Jansenism*, p. ii. p. 516.

CENT. XVII. solemn remonstrances addressed both to the king of *France* and the Roman pontif. These resolute protesters were joined by ANNE GENEVIEVE DE BOURBON, dutchess of *Longueville*, a heroine of the first rank both in birth and magnanimity, who, having renounced the pleasures and vanities of the world, which had long employed her most serious thoughts, espoused, with a devout ardour, the doctrines and cause of the *Jansenists*, and most earnestly implored the clemency of the Roman pontif in their behalf. Moved by these entreaties, and also by other arguments and considerations of like moment, CLEMENT IX became so indulgent as to accept of a conditional subscription to the famous declaration, and to permit doctors of scrupulous consciences to sign it according to the mental interpretation, they thought proper to give it. This instance of papal condescension and lenity was no sooner made public, than the *Jansenists* began to come forth from their lurking places, to return from their voluntary exile, and to enjoy their former tranquillity and freedom, being exempt from all uneasy apprehensions of any further persecution.

This remarkable event is commonly called the *Peace of CLEMENT IX*; its duration, nevertheless, was but transitory [u]. It was violated, in the year 1676, at the instigation of the *Jesuits*, by LEWIS XIV, who declared, in a public edict, that it had only been granted for a time out of a condescending indulgence to the tender and scrupulous consciences of a certain number of persons; but it was totally abolished, after the death of the dutchess of LONGUEVILLE, which happened in the year 1679, and deprived the *Jansenists* of their principal support. From that time their calamities were renewed, and they were pursued with the same malignity and rage that they had before experienced. Some of them avoided the rising storm by a voluntary exile; others sustained it with invincible fortitude and constancy of mind; others turned aside its fury, and escaped its violence, as well as they could, by dexterity and prudence. ANTHONY ARNAULD, who was

[u] The transactions, relating to this event, which were carried on under the pontificate of CLEMENT IX, are circumstantially related by Cardinal ROSPIGLIOSI, in his *Commentarii*, which DU PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE has subjoined to his *Elementa Theologica*, published in 8^{vo} at *Paris*, in the year 1716. See also this last-mentioned author's *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 336. in which the letters of CLEMENT IX are inserted. Two *Jansenists* have written the History of the *Clementine Peace*, VAVET, vicar to the archbishop of *Sens*, in an anonymous work, entitled, *Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans l'affaire de la Paix de l'Eglise sous la Pape CLEMENT IX*; and QUESNEL, in an anonymous production also, entitled, *La Paix de CLEMENT IX, ou Demonstration des deux faussetés capitales avancées dans l'Histoire des Cinq Propositions contre la foi des Disciples de St. AUGUSTIN*. That VAVET was the author of the former, is asserted in the *Catechisme Historique sur les contestations de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 352; and that the latter came from the pen of QUESNEL, we learn from the writer of the *Bibliothèque Janseniste*, p. 314.—There was another accurate and interesting account of this transaction published in the year 1706, in two volumes, 8^o. under the following title: *Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans l'affaire de la paix de l'Eglise sous le Pape CLEMENT IX, avec les Lettres, Actes, Memoires, et autres pieces qui y ont rapport*.—The important services that the dutchess of *Longueville* rendered the *Jansenists* in this affair are related with elegance and spirit by VILLFORT, in his *Vie d'Anne Genevieve de Bourbon, Duchesse de Longueville*, tom. ii. livr. vi. p. 89. of the edition of *Amsterdam* (1739), which is more complete and ample than the edition of *Paris*.

the head and leader of the party, fled into *Holland* in the year 1679 [w]; and, in this retreat, he not only escaped the fury of his enemies, but had it in his power to hurt them considerably, and actually made the Jesuits feel the weight of his talents and the extent of his influence. For the admirable eloquence and sagacity of this great man gave him such an ascendant in the *Netherlands*, that the greatest part of the churches, there, embraced his opinions, and adopted his cause; the Romish congregations in *Holland* also, were, by his influence and the ministry of his intimate friends and adherents JOHN NEERCASSEL and PETER CODDEUS, bishops of *Castorie* and *Sebasto* [x], entirely gained over to the Jansenist party. These latter still persevere with the utmost steadfastness in the principles of Jansenism; and, secured under the protection of the Dutch government, defy the threats and hold in derision the resentment of the Roman pontiffs [y].

CENT. XVII.

XLVI. It is not only on account of their embracing the doctrine of AUGUSTIN concerning Divine Grace (a doctrine which bears a striking resemblance with that of the Calvinists) that the Jansenists have incurred the displeasure and resentment of the Jesuits. They are charged with many other circumstances, which appear intolerable to the warm votaries of the church of *Rome*. And indeed it is certain, that the various controversies, which have been mentioned above, were excited in that church principally by the Jansenists, and have been propagated and handed down by them, even to our times, in a prodigious multitude of their books, published both in *France* and in the *Netherlands* [z]. But that which offends most the Jesuits, and the other creatures of the Roman pontif, is the austerity of this party, and the severity that reigns in their system of moral discipline and practical religion. For the Jansenists cry out against the corruptions of the church of *Rome*, and complain that neither its doctrines nor morals retain any traces of their former purity. They reproach the clergy with an universal depravation of sentiments and manners, and an entire forgetfulness of the dignity of their character and the duties of their vocation. They censure the licentiousness of the monastic Orders, and insist upon the necessity of reforming their discipline according to the rules of sanctity, abstinence, and self-denial that were originally prescribed by their respective founders. They maintain also, that the people ought to be carefully instructed in all the doctrines and precepts of Christianity, and that, for this purpose, the Holy Scriptures and Public Liturgies should be offered to their perusal in their mother-

The austere piety of the Jansenists.

[w] For an account of this great man, see BAYLE's *Dictionary*, vol. i. at the article ANTHONY ARNAUD; as also *Histoire abrégée de la vie et des ouvrages de M. ARNAUD*, published at *Cologne*, in 8^{vo}.—The change introduced into the Romish churches in *Holland* is mentioned by LAFITAU, *Vie de CLEMENT XI.* tom. i. p. 123. For an account of CODDEUS, NEERCASSEL, and VARET, and the other patrons of Jansenism among the Dutch, see the *Dictionnaire des Livres Jansenistes*, tom. i. p. 48. 21. 353. tom. ii. p. 406. tom. iv. p. 119.

[x] Bishops in *partibus infidelium*.

[(y)] It must however be observed, that, notwithstanding the ascendant the Jansenists have in *Holland*, the Jesuits, for some time past, have by artifice and disguise got a certain footing among the Romish churches that are tolerated by the republic.]

[z] See *Hist. Eccles. Rom.* Sæc. xvi. § xxxi.

CENT. XVII.

tongue; and, finally, they look upon it as a matter of the highest moment to persuade all Christians that true piety does not consist in the observance of pompous rites, or in the performance of external acts of devotion, but in inward holiness and divine love.

These sentiments of the Jansenists, on a general view, seem just and rational, and suitable to the spirit and genius of Christianity; but when we examine the particular branches into which they extend these general principles, the consequences they deduce from them, and the manner in which they apply them, in their rules of discipline and practice, we shall find that the piety of this famous party is deeply tinged both with superstition and fanaticism; that it, more especially, favours the harsh and enthusiastical opinion of the *Mystics*; and, of consequence, that the Jansenists are not undeservedly branded by their adversaries with the denomination of *Rigourists* [a]. This denomination they merited, in a peculiar manner, by their

[a] They, who desire to form a just notion of the dismal piety of the Jansenists (which carries the unseemly features of that gloomy devotion, that was formerly practised by fanatical hermits in the deserts of *Syria*, *Libya*, and *Egypt*, but is entirely foreign from the dictates of reason and the amiable spirit of Christianity) have only to peruse the epistles and other writings of the *Abbot of St. CYRAN*, who is the great oracle of the party. This abbot was a well-meaning man; and his piety, such as it was, carried in it the marks of sincerity and fervor; he was also superior, perhaps, as a pastor to the greatest part of the Roman-catholic doctors; and his learning, more especially his knowledge of religious antiquity, was very considerable: but to propose this man as a compleat and perfect model of genuine piety, and as a most accurate and accomplished teacher of *Christian* virtue, is an absurdity peculiar to the Jansenists, and can be adopted by no person, who knows what genuine piety and *Christian* virtue are. That we may not seem to detract rashly, and without reason from the merit of this eminent man, it will not be improper to confirm what we have said by some instances. This good abbot, having undertaken to vanquish the *Heretics* (i. e. the Protestants) in a prolix and extensive work, was obliged to read, or at least to look into, the various writings published by that *impious tribe*, and this he did in company with his nephew *MARTIN DE BARCOS*, who resembled him, entirely in his sentiments and manners. But before he would venture to open a book composed by a Protestant, he constantly marked it with the sign of the cross, to expel the evil spirit. What weakness and superstition did this ridiculous proceeding discover! for the good man was persuaded that *Satan* had fixed his residence in the books of the Protestants; but it is not so easy to determine where he imagined the wicked spirit lay, whether in the paper, in the letters, between the leaves, or in the doctrines of these infernal productions? Let us see the account that is given of this matter by *LANCELOT*, in his *Memoires touchant la vie de M. l'Abbé de S. Cyran*, tom. i. p. 226. His words are as follows: *Il lisait ces Livres avec tant de piété, qu'en les prenant il les exorcisoit toujours en faisant le signe de la Croix dessus, ne doutant point que le Demon n'y residât actuellement.* His attachment to *AUGUSTIN* was so excessive, that he looked upon as sacred and divine even those opinions of that great man, which the wiser part of the Romish doctors had rejected as erroneous and highly dangerous. Such, among others, was that extravagant and pernicious tenet, that *the saints are the only lawful proprietors of the world*; and that *the wicked have no right, by the divine law, to those things, which they possess justly in consequence of the decisions of human law.* To this purpose is the following assertion of our abbot, as we find it in *FONTAINE'S Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, tom. i. p. 201. *Jesus Christ n'est encore entré dans la possession de son Royaume temporel et des biens du monde, qui lui appartiennent, que par cette PETITE PORTION qu'en tient l'Eglise par les benefices de ses Cleres, qui ne sont que les fermiers et les depositaires de Jesus Christ.* If, therefore, we are to give credit to this visionary man, the golden age is approaching, when *JESUS CHRIST*, having pulled down the mighty from their seats, and dethroned the kings and princes of the earth, shall reduce the whole world under his sole dominion, and give it over to the government of priests and monks, who are the princes of his church.—After we have seen such sentiments as these maintained by their oracle and chief, it is but natural to be surprised, when we hear the Jansenists boasting of their zeal in de-

doctrine

doctrine concerning Repentance and Penance, whose tendency, considered both in a civil and religious point in view, is singularly pernicious. For they make repentance consist chiefly in those voluntary sufferings, which the transgressor inflicts upon himself in proportion to the nature of his crimes and the degree of his guilt. As their notions of the extent of man's original corruption are exaggerated, they prescribe remedies to it that are of the same nature. They look upon Christians as bound to expiate this original guilt by acts of mortification performed in solitude and silence, by torturing and macerating their bodies, by painful labour, excessive abstinence, continual prayer and contemplation; and they hold every person obliged to increase these voluntary pains and sufferings, in proportion to the degree of corruption they have derived from nature, or contracted by a vitious and licentious course of life. Nay, they carry these austerities to so high a pitch, that they do not scruple to call those *holy* self-tormentors, who have gradually put an end to their days by excessive abstinence or labour, the *Sacred victims of repentance*, that have been consumed by the fire of divine love. Nay, they go still further and maintain, that the conduct of these self-murderers is peculiarly meritorious in the eye of heaven, and that their sufferings, macerations, and labours, appease the anger of the Deity, and not only contribute to their own felicity, but draw down abundant blessings upon their friends and upon the church. We might confirm this account by various examples, and more especially by that of the famous abbé DE PARIS, the great wonder-worker of the Jansenists, who put himself to a

sending sovereign states, and in general the civil rights of mankind, against the stratagems and usurpations of the Roman pontiffs.

The notions of the abbot of ST. CYRAN concerning prayer, which breathe the fanatical spirit of mysticism, will further confirm what we have said of his propensity to enthusiasm. It is, for example, a favourite maxim with him, that the Christian, who prays, ought never to recollect the good things he stands in need of in order to ask them of God, since true prayer does not consist in distinct notions and clear ideas of what we are doing in that solemn act, but in a certain blind impulse of divine love. Such is the account given of the abbot's sentiments on this head by LANCELOT, in his *Memoires touchant la vie de l'Abbé de S. Cyran*, tom. ii. p. 44. — *Il ne croyoit pas, says that author, que l'on pût faire quelque effort pour s'appliquer à quelque point, ou à quelque pensée particulière — parce que la véritable priere est plutôt un attrait de son amour, qui emporte notre cœur vers lui et nous enlève comme hors de nous-mêmes, que non pas une occupation de notre esprit, qui se remplit de l'idée de quelque objet quoique divin.* According to this hypothesis, the man prays best who neither thinks nor asks in that act of devotion. This is, indeed, a very extraordinary account of the matter, and contains an idea of prayer, which seems to have been quite unknown to CHRIST and his Apostles; for the former has commanded us to address our prayers to God in a set form of words; and the latter frequently tell us the subjects of their petitions and supplications.

But of all the errors of this Arch-jansenist, none was so pernicious as the fanatical notion he entertained of his being the residence of the Deity, the instrument of the Godhead, and by which the divine nature itself essentially operated. It was in consequence of this dangerous principle, that he recommends it as a duty incumbent on all pious men to follow, without consulting their judgment or any other guide, the first motions and impulses of their minds, as the dictates of heaven. And indeed the Jansenists in general are intimately persuaded, that God operates immediately upon the minds of those who have composed, or rather suppressed, all the motions of the understanding and of the will, and that to such he declares, from above, his intentions and commands; since whatever thoughts, designs, or inclinations arise within them, in this calm state of tranquillity and silence, are to be considered as the direct suggestions and oracles of the divine wisdom. See, for a further account of this pestilential doctrine, *Memoires de Port-Royal*, tom. iii. p. 246.

CENT. XVII. most painful death, in order to satisfy the justice of an incensed God [b]; for such was the picture he had formed of the best of beings in his disordered fancy.

The convent of
Port-Royal.

XLVII. A striking example of this austere, forbidding, and extravagant species of devotion was exhibited in that celebrated female convent, called *Port-Royal in the fields*, which was situated in a retired, deep, and gloomy vale, not far from *Paris*. The inspection and government of this austere society was given by HENRY IV, about the commencement of this century, to JAQUELINE, daughter of ANTHONY ARNAUD [c], who, after her conversion, assumed the name of MARIE ANGELIQUE DE LA ST. MADELAINE. This lady had at first led a very dissolute life [d], which was the general case of the cloistered fair in *France* about this period; but a remarkable change happened in her sentiments and manners, in the year 1609, when she resolved no more to live like a nun, but to consecrate her future days to deep devotion and penitential exercises. This holy resolution was strengthened by her acquaintance with the famous FRANÇOIS DE SALES, and the abbot of ST. CYRAN. The last of these pious connexions she formed in the year 1623, and modelled both her own conduct and the manners of her convent after the doctrine and example of these devout men. Hence it happened, that, during the whole course of this century, the convent of *Port-Royal* excited the indignation of the Jesuits, the admiration of the Jansenists, and the attention of *Europe*. The holy virgins of this famous society observed, with the utmost rigour and exactness, that ancient rule of the Cistercians, which had been almost every where abrogated on account of its excessive and intolerable austerity, nay, they even went beyond its most cruel demands [e]. Such was the fame of this devout nunnery, that multitudes of

[b] See MORINUS, *Comm. de Pœnitentia*, Præf. p. 3. in which there is a tacit censure of the penance of the Jansenists.—See, on the other hand, the *Mémoires de Port-Royal*, p. 483.—The Jansenists, among all the meritorious actions of the abbot of ST. CYRAN, find none more worthy of admiration and applause than his restoring from oblivion the true system of penitential discipline, and they consider him as the second author or parent of the doctrine of penance. See *Mémoires de Port-Royal*, tom. iii. p. 445. 504.—This very doctrine, however, of penance was one of the principal reasons of his being committed to prison by the order of Cardinal RICHELIEU. *Ibid.* tom. i. p. 233. 452.

[c] An eminent lawyer and father to the famous ARNAUD, doctor in *Sorbonne*.

[d] The dissolute life imputed to this abbess by Dr. MOSHEIM is an egregious mistake; which seems to have proceeded from his misunderstanding a passage in BAYLE's *Dictionnaire*, vol. i. p. 338. note F, fourth edition, in French.]

[e] There is a prodigious multitude of books still extant, in which the rise, progress, laws, and sanctity of this famous convent are described and extolled by eminent Jansenists, who, at the same time, deplore its fate in the most doleful strains. Of this multitude we shall mention those only which are easy to be acquired, and which contain the most modern and circumstantial accounts of that celebrated establishment.—The Benedictines of *St. Maur* have given an exact, though dry, history of this convent in their *Gallia Christiana*, tom. vii. p. 910. A more elegant and agreeable account of it, but an account charged with imperfection and partiality, was composed by the famous poet RACINE, under the title of *Abregé de l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, and was published, after having passed through many preceding editions, in the year 1750, at *Amsterdam*, among the works of his son LEWIS RABINE, tom. ii. p. 275—366. The external state and form of this convent are professedly described by MOLEON, in his *Voyages Liturgiques*, p. 234.—Add to these, NIC. FONTAINE, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, published at *Cologne* (or rather at

pious persons were ambitious to dwell in its neighbourhood, and that a great part of the *Jansenist-penitents*, or self-tormentors, of both sexes built huts without its precincts, where they imitated the manners of those austere and gloomy fanatics, who, in the fourth and fifth centuries, retired into the wild and uncultivated places of *Syria* and *Egypt*, and were commonly called *The Fathers of the Desert*. The end, which these Penitents had in view, was, by silence, hunger, thirst, prayer, bodily labour, watchings, sorrow, and other voluntary acts of self denial, to efface the guilt and remove the pollution the soul had derived from natural corruptions, or evil habits [f]. They did not, however, all observe the same discipline or follow the same kind of application and labour. The more learned consumed their strength in composing laborious productions filled with sacred and profane erudition, and some of these have, no doubt, deserved well of the republic of letters: others were employed in teaching youth the rudiments of language and the principles of science: but the far greatest part exhausted both the health of their bodies and the vigour of their minds in servile industry and rural labour; and thus pined away by a slow kind of death. What is singularly surpriz-

Utrecht) in two volumes, 8^{vo}. in the year 1738.—Du FOSSE, *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*.—*Recueil de plusieurs pieces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, published at *Utrecht*, in 8^{vo}. in the year 1740.—The editor of this last compilation promises, in his Preface, further collections of pieces relative to the same subject, and seems to insinuate that a compleat history of *Port-Royal*, drawn from these and other valuable and authentic records, will sooner or later see the light. See, besides the authors abovementioned, LANCELOT, *Memoires touchant la Vie de l'Abbé de St. Cyran*. All these authors confine their relations to the external form and various revolutions of this famous convent. Its internal state, its rules of discipline, the manners of its virgins, and the incidents and transactions that have happened between them and the holy neighbourhood of Jansenists, are described and related by another set of writers; see *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal, et à la Vie de MARIE ANGELIQUE D'ARNAUD*, published at *Utrecht*, in 5 vols. 8^{vo}. in the year 1742.—*Vies intéressantes et edifiantes des religieuses de Port-Royal, et de plusieurs personnes qui leur étoient attachées*. There are already four volumes of this work published, of which the first appeared at *Utrecht* in the year 1750, in 8^{vo}. and it must be acknowledged, that they all contain several anecdotes and records that are interesting and curious.—For an account of the suppression and abolition of this convent, see the *Memoires sur la destruction de l'Abbaye de Port-Royal des Champs*, published in 8^{vo} in 1711.—If we are not much mistaken, all these histories and relations have been much less serviceable to the reputation of this famous convent, than the Jansenist party are willing to think. When we view ARNAUD, TILLEMONT, NICOLE, LE MAITRE, and the other authors of *Port-Royal*, in their learned productions, they then appear truly great; but when we lay aside their works, and, taking up these histories of *Port-Royal*, see these great men, in private life, in the constant practice of that austere discipline of which the Jansenists boast so foolishly, they, indeed, then shrink almost to nothing, appear in the contemptible light of fanatics, and seem totally unworthy of the fame they have acquired. When we read the *Discourses* that ISAAC LE MAITRE, commonly called SACY, pronounced at the bar, together with his other ingenious productions, we cannot refuse him the applause that is due to such an elegant and accomplished writer; but when we meet with this polite author at *Port-Royal*, mixed with labourers and reapers, and with the spade or the sickle in his hand, he then certainly makes a comical figure, and can scarcely be looked upon as perfectly right in his head.

[f] Among the first and most eminent of these penitents was ISAAC LE MAITRE, a celebrated lawyer at *Paris*, whose eloquence had procured him a shining reputation, and who, in the year 1637, retired to *Port-Royal* to make expiation for his sins. The retreat of this eminent man raised new enemies to the abbot of ST. CYRAN. See the *Memoires pour l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, tom. i. p. 233.—The example of LE MAITRE was followed by a vast number of persons of all ranks, and, among these, by some persons of the highest distinction. See *Vies des Religieuses de Port-Royal*, tom. i. p. 141.

ing

CENT. XVII. ing is, that many of these voluntary victims of an inhuman piety were persons illustrious both by their birth and stations, who, after having distinguished themselves in civil or military employments, debased themselves so far in this penitential retreat, as to assume the character, offices, and labours of the lowest servants.

This celebrated retreat of the devout and austere Jansenists was subject to many vicissitudes during the whole course of this century; at one time it flourished in unrivalled glory; at another it seemed eclipsed, and on the brink of ruin. At length, however, the period of its total extinction approached. The nuns obstinately refused to subscribe the declaration of Pope ALEXANDER VII, that has been so often mentioned; on the other hand, their convent and rule of discipline was considered as detrimental to the interests of the kingdom, and a dishonour to some of the first families in *France*; hence LEWIS XIV, in the year 1709, set on by the violent counsels of the Jesuits, ordered the convent of *Port-Royal* to be demolished, the whole building to be levelled with the ground, and the nuns to be removed to *Paris*. And, lest there should still remain some secret fuel to nourish the shame of superstition in that place, he ordered the very carcases of the nuns and devout Jansenists to be dug up and buried elsewhere.

The controversy concerning the Immaculate conception of the Virgin MARY.

XLVIII. The other controversies that disturbed the tranquillity of the church of *Rome*, were but light blasts when compared with this violent hurricane. The old debate between the Franciscans and Dominicans, concerning the *Immaculate conception of the Virgin MARY*, which was maintained by the former, and denied by the latter, gave much trouble and perplexity to the Roman pontifs, and more especially to PAUL V, GREGORY XV, and ALEXANDER VII. The kingdom of *Spain* was thrown into such combustion, and so miserably divided into factions, by this controversy, about the beginning of this century, that solemn embassies were sent to *Rome*, both by PHILIP III and his successor, with a view to engage the Roman pontif to determine the question, or, at any rate, to put an end to the contest by a public bull. But, notwithstanding the weighty solicitations of these monarchs, the oracle of *Rome* pronounced nothing but ambiguous words, and its high priests prudently avoided coming to a plain and positive decision of the matter in question. For if they were awed, on the one hand, by the warm remonstrances of the Spanish court, which favoured the sentiment of the Franciscans, they were restrained on the other by the credit and influence of the Dominicans. So that, after the most earnest entreaties and importunities, all that could be obtained from the pontif, by the court of *Spain*, was a declaration, intimating that the opinion of the Franciscans had a high degree of probability on its side, and forbidding the Dominicans to oppose it in a public manner; but this declaration was accompanied with another, by which the Franciscans were prohibited, in their turn, from treating as erroneous the doctrine of the Dominicans [g]. This pacific ac-

[g] See FRID. ULR. CALIXTI *Historia Immaculatae Conceptionis B. Virginis MARIÆ*, published at *Helmstadt* in 4^{to}. in the year 1696.—HORNBECKII *Comm. ad Bullam URBANI VIII, de diebus Festis*, p. 250.—LAUNOII *Præscriptiones de Conceptu Virginis MARIÆ*, tom. i. p. i. oper. p. 9. commodation

commodation of matters would have been highly laudable in a prince or civil magistrate, who, unacquainted with theological questions of such an abstruse nature, preferred the tranquillity of his people to the discussion of such an intricate and unimportant point; but whether it was honourable to the Roman pontif, who boasts of a Divine right to decide all religious controversies, and pretends to a degree of inspiration that places him beyond the possibility of erring, we leave to the consideration of those who have his glory at heart.

XLIX. The controversies with the Mystics were now renewed, and that sect which, in former times, enjoyed such a high degree of reputation and authority, was treated with the greatest severity, and involved in the deepest distress, towards the conclusion of this century. This unhappy change in their affairs was principally occasioned by the fanaticism and imprudence of MICHAEL DE MOLINOS, a Spanish priest, who resided at Rome, and the fame of whose ardent piety and devotion procured him a considerable number of disciples of both sexes. A book published at Rome, in the year 1681, by this ecclesiastic, under the title of the *Spiritual Guide*, alarmed the doctors of the church [b]. This book contained, besides the usual precepts and institutions of Mystic theology, several notions relating to a *spiritual and contemplative life*, that seemed to revive the pernicious and infernal errors of the *Beghards*, and open a door to all sorts of dissolution and licentiousness. The principles of MOLINOS, which have been very differently interpreted by his friends and enemies, amount to this: "That the whole of religion consists in the perfect *calm and tranquillity* of a mind, removed from all external and finite things, and centred in God, and in such a *pure love* of the supreme Being as is independent on all prospect of interest or reward;" or, to express the doctrine of this Mystic in other words, "The

Quietism or the controversies occasioned by the doctrine of Molinos.

—Long after this period CLEMENT XI went a step further, and appointed, in the year 1708, a festival, to be annually celebrated, in honour of the *Immaculate Conception of the Virgin MARY*, throughout the Romish church. See the *Memoires de Trevoux*, for the year 1709, art. xxxvii. p. 514. But the Dominicans obstinately deny that the obligation of this law extends to them, and persist in maintaining their ancient doctrine, though with more modesty and circumspection than they formerly discovered in this debate. And when we consider that this doctrine of theirs has never been expressly condemned by any pope, and that they are not, in the least, molested nor even censured for refusing to celebrate the festival abovementioned, it appears evidently, from all this, that the terms of the papal edict are to be understood with certain restrictions, and interpreted in a mild and indulgent manner; and that the spirit of this edict is not contrary to the tenor of the former declarations of the pontifs on this head. See LAMINDUS PRITANIUS (a fictitious name assumed by the author, MURATORI) *De ingeniorum moderatione in religionis negotio*, p. 254.

[b] This book, which was composed in Spanish, and published, for the first time, in the year 1675, was honoured with the approbation and encomiums of many eminent and respectable personages. It was published in Italian in several places, and, at length, at Rome in 1681. It was afterwards translated into French, Dutch, and Latin, and passed through several editions in France, Italy, and Holland. The Latin translation, which bears the title of *Manuductio Spiritualis*, was published at Halle in the year 1687, in 8^{vo}. by FRANK. There is another work of MOLINOS, composed in the same spirit, *Concerning the daily celebration of the Communion*, which was also condemned. See the *Recueil de diverses pieces concernant le Quietisme et les Quietistes ou MOLINOS, ses sentimens et ses disciples*, published in 8^{vo} at Amsterdam, in the year 1688, in which the reader will find a French translation of the *Spiritual Guide*, together with a collection of Letters on various subjects, written by MOLINOS.

"soul,

CENT. XVII. "soul, in the pursuit of the *supreme good*, must retire from the reports and gratifications of sense, and, in general, from all corporeal objects, and, imposing silence upon all the motions of the understanding and will, must be *absorbed* in the Deity." Hence the denomination of *Quietists* was given to the followers of MOLINOS; though that of *Mystics*, which was their vulgar title, was more applicable, and expressed with more propriety their fanatical system. For the doctrine of MOLINOS had no other circumstance of novelty attending it than the singular and unusual terms he employed in unfolding his notions, and the ingenuity he discovered in digesting what the ancient Mystics had thrown out in the most confused and incoherent jargon, into something that looked like a system. The Jesuits, and other zealous votaries of *Rome*, soon perceived that the system of MOLINOS was a tacit censure of the Romish church, as having departed from the spirit of true religion by placing the essence of piety in external works, and in the performance of a certain round of rites and ceremonies. But the warmest opponents MOLINOS met with was from the French ambassador [i] at *Rome*, who raised a most violent persecution against him. This made many imagine that it was not the theological system of MOLINOS alone, that had inflamed the resentment of that minister, but that some considerations of a political nature had been blended with this famous controversy, and that the Spanish Mystic had opposed the designs and negotiations of the French monarch at the court of *Rome*. However that may have been, MOLINOS, unable to resist the storm, and abandoned by those from whom he chiefly expected succour, yielded to it, in the year 1685, when, notwithstanding the number, rank, and credit of his friends at *Rome*, and the particular marks of favour he had received from the Roman pontif [k], he was cast into prison. Two years after this he was obliged to renounce, in a public manner, the errors of which he was accused, and this solemn recantation was followed by a sentence of perpetual imprisonment, from which he was, in an advanced age, delivered by death in the year 1696 [l]. The candid and impartial will be obliged to acknowledge, that the opinions and expressions of this enthusiast were perfidiously misrepresented and perverted by the Jesuits and others, whose interest it was, that he should be put out of the way, and excluded from every thing but contemplation and repose; and it is most certain, that his doctrine was charged with consequences, which he neither approved, nor even apprehended. But, on the other hand, it must also be confessed, that the system of MOLINOS was chargeable with the greatest part of the reproaches, that are justly thrown upon the Mystics, and favoured much

[i] Cardinal D'ETREES.

[k] INNOCENT XI.

[l] He was born in the diocese of *Saragossa* in the year 1627; see *Biblioth. Janseniste*, p. 469.—For an account of this controversy, see the *Narrative of the Proceedings in the Controversy concerning Quietism*, which is subjoined to the German translation of BURNET's Travels.—As also ARNOLDI *Historia Eccles. et Hæretic.* tom. iii. c. xvii. p. 176.—JAEGERI *Hist. Eccles. et Polit. Sæculi xvii.* Decenn. ix. p. 26.—PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 357. where may be seen the papal edicts relating to this controversy.

the illusions and follies of those fanatics, who would make the crude visions of their disordered fancies pass for divine revelations [m].

L. It would have been truly surprising had a system of piety, that was so adapted to seduce the indolent mind, to captivate the warm imagination and to melt the tender heart, been destitute of votaries and followers. But this was, by no means, the case. In *Italy, Spain, France, and the Netherlands*, MOLINOS had a considerable number of disciples, and, besides the reasons we have now hinted, another circumstance must have contributed much to multiply his votaries; for in all parts of the Romish dominion there were numbers of persons, who had sense and knowledge enough to perceive, that the whole of religion could not consist in external rites and bodily mortifications, but too little to direct themselves in religious matters, or to substitute what was right in the place of what they knew to be wrong; and hence it was natural enough for them to follow the first plausible guide that was offered to them. But the church of *Rome*, apprehensive of the consequences of this Mystic theology, left no method unemployed that could contribute to stop its progress; and by the force of promises and threatenings, of severity and mildness properly applied, stifled, in their birth, the commotions and changes it seemed adapted to excite. The death of MOLINOS contributed also to expel the anxiety of the Romish doctors, since his disciples and followers seemed too inconsiderable to deserve any notice. Among these are generally reckoned Cardinal PETRUCCI, FRANCIS DE LA COMBE, a Barnabite friar, the spiritual detector of *Madame GUYON*, who shall be mentioned more particularly, FRANCIS MALAVALLE, BERNIERE DE LOUVIGNI, and others of less note. These enthusiasts, as is common among the Mystics, differ from MOLINOS in several points, and are also divided among themselves; this diversity is, however, rather nominal than real; and, if we consider the true signification of the terms, by which they express their respective notions, we shall find that they all set out from the same principles and tend to the same conclusions [n].

Followers of
Molinos.

LI. One of the principal patrons and propagators of *Quietism* in *France* was MARIE BOUVIERES DE LA MOTHE GUYON, a woman of fashion, remarkable for the goodness of her heart and the regularity of her manners, but of an inconstant and unsettled temper, and subject to be drawn away by the seduction of a warm and unbridled fancy. This female apostle of Mysticism derived all her ideas of religion from the dictates of her own heart [o], and described its nature to others according as she felt it herself;

The case of Ma-
dame Guyon and
Fenelon.

[m] All that can be alledged in defence of MOLINOS has been gathered together by WEIS-MANNUS, in his *Histor. Ecclesiast. Sæc. xvii.* p. 555.

[n] The writings of these fanatics are enumerated and sharply criticized by COLONIA, in the *Bibliothèque Quietiste* (which he has subjoined to his *Bibliothèque Janseniste*) p. 455—488.—See also GOD. ARNOLDI *Historia et Descriptio Theologiæ Mysticæ*, p. 364. & POIRET'S *Bibliotheca Mysticorum*, published at *Amsterdam* in 8°. in the year 1708.

[o] Madame GUYON wrote her own life and spiritual adventures in French, and published them in the year 1720. Her writings, which abound with childish allegories and mystic ejaculations, have been translated into German. Her principal production was *La Bible de Mad. GUYON avec des explications et reflexions, qui regardent la vie interieure*. This Bible, with Anno-

a manner

CENT. XVII. a manner of proceeding of all others the most uncertain and delusive. And accordingly, her religious sentiments made a great noise in the year 1687, and gave offence to many. Hence, after they had been accurately and attentively examined by several men of eminent piety and learning, they were at length pronounced erroneous and unsound; and, in the year 1697, were professedly confuted by the celebrated BOSSUET. This gave rise to a controversy of still greater moment between the prelate last mentioned and FRANCIS SALIGNAC DE FENELON, archbishop of *Cambray*, whose sublime virtue and superior genius were beheld with veneration in all the countries of *Europe*. Of these two disputants, who, in point of eloquence, were avowedly without either superiors or equals in *France*; the latter seemed disposed to favour the religious system of Madame GUYON. For when BOSSUET desired his approbation of the book he had composed in answer to the sentiments of that female Mystic, FENELON not only refused it, but openly declared that this pious woman had been treated with great partiality and injustice, and that the censures of her adversary were unmerited and groundless. Nor did the warm imagination of this amiable prelate permit him to stop here, where the dictates of prudence ought to have set bounds to his zeal; for, in the year 1697, he published a book [p], in which he adopted several of the tenets of Madame GUYON, and, more especially, that favourite doctrine of the Mystics, which teaches that the love of the supreme Being must be pure and disinterested; that is, exempt from all views of interest and all hope of reward [q]. This doctrine FENELON explained with a pathetic eloquence, and confirmed it by the authority of many of the most eminent and pious among the Romish doctors. BOSSUET, whose leading passion was ambition, and who beheld with anxiety the rising fame and eminent talents of FENELON as an obstacle to his glory, was highly exasperated by this opposition, and left no method unemployed, which artifice and jealousy could suggest, to mortify a rival whom illustrious merit had rendered so formidable. For this purpose he threw himself at the feet of LEWIS XIV, implored the succours of the Roman pontif, and, by his im-

tations relating to the hidden or internal life, was published, in the year 1715, at *Amsterdam*, under the name of *Cologne*, in twenty volumes, in 8°. which abundantly discover the fertile imagination and shallow judgment of this female mystic—See a further account of her in the *Letters of Mad. de MAINTENON*, tom. i. p. 249. tom. ii. p. 45. 47. 49. 51.

[p] This book was entitled, *Explication des Maximes des Saints sur la vie interieure*. It has been translated into Latin.

[(q) This doctrine of the Mystics has thus far a foundation in reason and philosophy, that the moral perfections of the Deity are, in themselves, *intrinsically amiable*; and that their *excellence* is as much adapted to excite our esteem and love, as the experience of their beneficent effects, in promoting our well-being, is to inflame our gratitude. The error, therefore, of the Mystics lay in their drawing extravagant conclusions from a right principle, and in their requiring, in their followers, a perpetual abstraction and separation of ideas, which are intimately connected and, as it were, blended together, such as *felicity* and *perfection*; for though these two are inseparable in fact, yet the Mystics, from a fantastic pretension to disinterestedness, would separate them right or wrong, and turned their whole attention to the latter. In their views also of the supreme Being, they overlooked the important relations he bears to us as *benefactor* and *rewarder*; relations that give rise to noble sentiments and important duties, and confined their views to his supreme *beauty*, *excellence*, and *perfection*.]

portunities

portunities and stratagems, obtained at length the condemnation of FENELON's book. This condemnation was pronounced, in the year 1699, by INNOCENT XII, who, in a public brief, declared that book unsound in general, and branded with more peculiar marks of disapprobation twenty-three propositions, specified by the *Congregation* that had been appointed to examine it. The book, however, was condemned alone, without any mention of the author; and the conduct of FENELON on this occasion was very remarkable. He declared publicly his entire acquiescence in the sentence, by which his book had been condemned, and not only read that sentence to his people in the pulpit at *Cambray*, but exhorted them to respect and obey the papal decree [r]. This step was differently interpreted, by different persons, according to their notions of this great man, or their respective ways of thinking. Some considered it as an instance of true magnanimity, as the mark of a meek and gentle spirit, that preferred the peace of the church to every private view of interest or glory. Others, less charitable, looked upon this submissive conduct as ignoble and pusillanimous, as denoting manifestly a want of integrity, inasmuch as it supposed that the prelate in question condemned with his lips, what in his heart he believed to be true. One thing, indeed, seems generally agreed on, and that is, that FENELON persisted to the end of his days in the sentiments, which, in obedience to the order of the pope, he retracted and condemned in a public manner.

LII. Besides these controversies, which derived their importance chiefly from the influence and reputation of the disputants, and thus became productive of great tumults and divisions in the church, there were others excited by several innovators, whose new and singular opinions were followed with troubles, though of a less momentous and permanent nature. Such was the strange doctrine of ISAAC LA PEYRERE, who, in two small treatises, published in the year 1655, maintained, that it is the origin of the Jewish nation, and not of the human race, that we find recorded in the books of MOSES, and that our globe was inhabited by many nations before ADAM, whom he considered as the father of the Jews. Though PEYRERE was a protestant, when he published this opinion, yet the doctors of the Romish church looked upon themselves as obliged to punish an error, that seemed to strike at the foundation of all Revealed Religion; and therefore, in the year 1656, had him seized at *Brussels*, and cast into prison, where, to escape the flames, he publicly renounced his erroneous system, and, to make a full expiation for it, embraced the popish religion [s].

La Peyrere,
White, Sfondrati, and Bor-
rhi.

[r] An ample and impartial account of this controversy has been given by TOUSSAINTS DU PLESSIS, a Benedictine, in his *Histoire de l'Eglise de MEAUX*, livr. v. tom. i. p. 485—523.—RAMSAY, in his *Life of FENELON*, written in French, and published at the *Hague* in the year 1723, is less impartial; but is nevertheless worthy of being consulted on this subject. See VOLTAIRE, *Siecle de LOUIS XIV*, tom. ii. p. 301.—The public acts and edicts relating to this controversy have been collected by DU PLESSIS ARGENTRE, in his *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 402.

[s] BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article PEYRERE.—ARNOLDI *Histor. Eccles. et Hæret.* tom. iii. p. 70.—*Menagiana*, published by DE LA MONNOYE, tom. ii. p. 40.

CENT. XVII.

THOMAS WHITE, known at different times and in different countries by the names of ALBIUS, ANGLUS, CANDIDUS, BIANCHI [*t*], which he assumed successively, made a considerable figure, about the middle of this century, in *England, Portugal, France*, and the *Netherlands*, by the number and subtilty of his philosophical productions; but he also incurred the displeasure of many of the doctors of his communion, on account of the novelty and singularity of his opinions. He was, undoubtedly, a man of genius and penetration; but, being a passionate admirer of the Peripatetic philosophy, he ventured to employ it in the explication of some of the peculiar doctrines of the Romish church. This bold attempt led him imperceptibly out of the beaten road of popery, opened to him new views of things, and made him adopt notions that had never been heard of in the church of *Rome*; and hence his books were prohibited and condemned in several places, and particularly at *Rome* by the *Congregation of the Index*. This innovator is said to have died in *England*, his native country, and to have left a sect behind him, that embraced his doctrine, but, in process of time, fell into oblivion [*u*].

His peculiarities, however, were nothing, in comparison with the romantic notions of JOSEPH FRANCIS BORRI, a Milanese knight, eminent for his knowledge of chemistry and physic; but who, at the same time, appears to have been rather a madman than a heretic. The fancies, broached by this man, concerning the VIRGIN MARY, the HOLY GHOST, the erection of a new celestial kingdom, of which he himself was to be the founder, and the downfall of the Roman pontif, are so extravagant, so childish and absurd, that no sober person can view them in any other light than as the crude reveries of a disordered brain. Besides, the conduct of this fanatic, in several places, discovered the greatest vanity and levity, attended with that spirit of imposture that is usually visible in quacks and mountebanks; and, indeed, in the whole of his behaviour, he seemed destitute of sense, integrity, and prudence. The inquisitors had spread their snares for BORRI, but he luckily escaped them, and wandered up and down through a great part of *Europe*, giving himself out for another Esculapius, and pretending to be initiated into the most profound mysteries of chemical science. But in the year 1672, he imprudently fell into the clutches of the Roman pontif, who pronounced against him a sentence of perpetual imprisonment [*w*].

The last innovator we shall here mention is COELESTINE SFONDRATI, who, having formed the design of terminating the disputes concerning predestination by new explications of that doctrine, wrote a book upon that knotty subject, which threw into combustion, in the year

[(*t*) All these denominations were relating to his true name, which was WHITE. This man was a peculiar favourite of Sir KENELM DIGBY's, and mentions him with singular veneration in his philosophical writings.]

[*u*] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article ANGLUS.—BAILLET, *Vie de DES CARTES*, tom. ii. p. 245.

[*w*] There is a very interesting article in BAYLE's *Dictionary* relating to BORRI, in which all the extravagancies of that wrong-headed man are curiously related. See also ARNOLD, *loc. cit.* p. iii. c. xviii. p. 193.

1696, a considerable part of the Romish church; since it was, in some things, agreeable to none of the contending parties, and neither satisfied entirely the Jesuits nor their adversaries. Five French bishops, of great credit at the court of *Rome*, accused the author, notwithstanding the high rank of cardinal to which he had been raised on account of his extensive learning, of various errors, and more especially of having departed from the sentiments and doctrine of AUGUSTIN. This accusation was brought before INNOCENT XII, in the year 1696, but the contest, it seemed adapted to excite, was nipt in the bud. The pontif appeased, or rather put off, the French prelates, with a fair promise, that he would appoint a congregation to examine the cardinal's doctrine, and then pronounce sentence accordingly; but he forgot his promise, imitated the prudent conduct of his predecessors on like occasions, and did not venture to give a final decision of this intricate and knotty controversy [x].

LIII. There was scarcely any change introduced into the ritual of the Romish church during this century, if we except an edict of URBAN VIII, for diminishing the number of holidays, which was issued out in the year 1643 [y]; we shall therefore conclude this account with a list of the saints added to the Kalendar by the Roman pontifs during the period now before us. Canonisations.

In the year 1601, CLEMENT VIII raised to that spiritual dignity RAYMOND of PENNAFORT, the famous compiler of the *Decretals*; in 1608, FRANCES PONTIANI, a Benedictine nun; and, in 1610, the eminent and illustrious CHARLES BORROMEO, bishop of *Milan*, so justly celebrated for his exemplary piety, and almost unparalleled liberality and beneficence.

GREGORY XV conferred, in the year 1622, the honour of saintship on THERESIA, a native of *Avila* in *Spain*, and a nun of the Carmelite Order.

URBAN VIII, in the year 1623, conferred the same ghostly honours on PHILIP NERI, the founder of the Order, entitled, *Fathers of the Oratory*, in *Italy*; on IGNATIUS LOYOLA, the parent of the Jesuits; and on his chief disciple FRANCIS XAVIER, the jesuitical *Apostle of the Indians*.

ALEXANDER VII canonised, in the year 1658, THOMAS DE VILLANOVA, a Spanish monk of the Order of *St. Augustin*; and, in 1665, FRANCIS DE SALES, bishop of *Geneva*.

[x] This book, which was published at *Rome* in 4^{to}. in the year 1696, is entitled, *Nodus Prædestinationis dissolutus*.—The Letters of the French bishops, with the answer of the Roman pontif, are to be found in DU PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE'S *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. iii. p. ii. p. 394. & NATALIS ALEXANDER'S *Theologia Dogmatica et Moralis*, p. 877. The Letters of the bishops are remarkable in this respect, that they contain sharp animadversions against the Jesuits, and their discipline. The prelates express, in the strongest terms, their abhorrence of the doctrine of *philosophical sin*, which has rendered the Jesuits so deservedly infamous, and their detestation of the methods of propagating Christianity employed by the missionaries of that Order in *China*. Nay, to express their aversion to the doctrine of SFONDRATI, they say that his opinions are still more erroneous and pernicious than even those of the *Molinists*. The doctrine of this cardinal has been accurately represented and compared with that of AUGUSTIN by the learned BASNAGE, in his *Histoire de l'Eglise*, livr. xii. c. iii. § xi. p. 713.

[y] The bull issued out by URBAN VIII, for diminishing the number of the holidays celebrated in the church of *Rome*, may be seen in the *Nouvelle Bibliotheque*, tom. xv. p. 88.

CENT. XVII. CLEMENT X added to this ghostly list, in the year 1670, PEDRO DE ALCANTARA, a Franciscan monk; and MARIA MAGDALENA PACTII, a Florentine nun of the Carmelite Order; and, in the year 1671, ROSE, an American Virgin, of the third Order of Dominic, and LEWIS BERTRAND, a Dominican monk.

Under the pontificate of INNOCENT XII, faintship was conferred upon CAJETAN of *Vicenza*, regular clerk of the Order of Theatins, for whom that honour had been designed, twenty years before, by CLEMENT X, who died at the time the canonisation was to have been performed. JOHN of *Leon*, a Hermit of *St. Augustin*; PASCHAL BAYLONIOS, a Franciscan monk of the kingdom of *Arragon*; and JOHN DE DIEU, a Portuguese, and one of the Order of the *Brethren of Hospitality*; all of whom had been marked for a place in the Kalendar by ALEXANDER VIII, were solemnly canonised, in the year 1691, by INNOCENT XII [z].

CHAP. II.

The HISTORY of the GREEK and ORIENTAL CHURCH.

The state of the
Greek church.

I. THE history of the Greek and Eastern Christians, faithfully and accurately composed, would, no doubt, furnish us with a variety of entertaining and useful records; but the events that happen, and the transactions that are carried on, in these distant regions, are very rarely transmitted to us genuine and uncorrupted. The spirit of religious party, and the pious frauds it often engenders, want of proper information, and undistinguishing credulity, have introduced a fabulous mixture into the accounts we have of the state of the Christian religion in the East; and this consideration has engaged us to treat in a more concise manner, than would otherwise have been expedient, this particular branch of ecclesiastical history.

The Greek church, whose wretched situation was mentioned in the history of the preceding century, continued, during the present one, in the same deplorable state of ignorance and decay, destitute of the means of acquiring or promoting solid and useful knowledge. This account is, however, to be considered as taken from a general view of that church; for several of its members may be alledged as exceptions from this general character of ignorance, superstition, and corruption. Among that multi-

[z] The *Diplomas* of the pontiffs, relative to all these canonizations, may be seen in JUSTUS FONTANINUS's *Codex Constitutionum, quas summi Pontifices ediderunt in solemnibus Canonizationibus sanctorum*, p. 260. published, *in folio*, at Rome, in the year 1729. As they contain the particular reasons, which occasioned the elevation of these persons to a place in the Kalendar, and the peculiar kind of merit on which each of these ghostly promotions was founded, they offer abundant matter for reflexion and censure to a judicious reader. Nor would it be labour ill employed to inquire, without prejudice or partiality, into the justice, piety, and truth of what the popes alledge in these *Diplomas*, as the reasons inducing them to confer faintship on the persons therein mentioned.

tude of Greeks, who travel into *Sicily, Venice, Rome, England, Holland, and Germany*, or carry on trade in their own country, or fill honourable and important posts in the court of the Turkish emperor, there are, undoubtedly, several who are exempt from this reproach of ignorance and stupidity, of superstition and profligacy, and who make a figure by their opulence and credit [a]. But nothing can be more rooted and invincible than the aversion the Greeks in general discover to the Latin or Romish church; an aversion, which neither promises nor threatnings, artifice nor violence, have been able to conquer, or even to temper or diminish, and which has continued inflexible and unrelenting amidst the most zealous efforts of the Roman pontiffs, and the various means employed by their numerous missionaries to gain over this people to their communion and jurisdiction [b]. It is true, indeed, that the Latin doctors have founded churches in some of the islands of the *Archipelago*; but these congregations are poor and inconsiderable; nor will either the Greeks or their masters, the Turks, permit the Romish missionaries to extend further their spiritual jurisdiction.

II. Under the pontificate of URBAN VIII, great hopes were entertained of softening the antipathy of the Greeks against the Latin church [c], and

The story of
Cyrillus Lucar.

[a] I have been led to these remarks by the complaints of ALEXANDER HELLADIUS, and others, who see things in the light in which he has placed them. There is still extant a book, published in Latin by this author, in the year 1714, entitled, *The present State of the Greek Church*, in which he throws out the bitterest reproaches upon several authors of eminent merit and learning, who have given accounts of that church, and maintains that his brethren of the Greek communion are much more pious, learned, wise, and opulent, than they are commonly supposed to be. Instead of envying the Greeks the merit and felicity, which this panegyrist supposes them possessed of, we sincerely wish them much greater degrees of both. But we observe, at the same time, that, from the very accounts given by HELLADIUS, it would be easy to prove, that the state of the Greeks is not a whit better than it is generally supposed to be; though it may be granted, that the same ignorance, superstition, and immorality, do not abound alike in all places nor among all persons. See what we have remarked on this subject in the accounts we have given of the Eastern church during the sixteenth century.

[b] The Jesuit TARILLON has given an ample relation of the numerous *Missions* in *Greece* and the other provinces of the Ottoman empire, and of the present state of these *Missions*, in his Letter to PONTCHARTRAIN, *Sur l'état présent des Missions des Peres Jesuits dans la Grece*, which is published in the *Nouveaux Memoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tom. i. p. 1125. For an account of the state of the Romish religion in the islands of the *Archipelago*, see the Letter of the Jesuit XAVIER PORTIER, in the *Lettres edifiantes et curieuses écrites des Missions etrangeres*, tom. x. p. 328. These accounts are, 'tis true, somewhat embellished in order to advance the glory of the Jesuits; but the exaggerations of these missionaries may be easily corrected by the accounts of other writers, who, in our times, have treated this branch of ecclesiastical history. See, above all others, R. SIMON's (under the fictitious name of SANIOZE) *Bibliothèque Critique*, tom. i. c. xxiii. p. 340. and especially p. 346. where the author confirms a remarkable fact, which we have mentioned above upon the authority of URBAN CERRI, viz. that amidst the general dislike, which the Greeks have of the Romish church, none carry this dislike to such a high degree of antipathy and aversion, as those very Greeks, who have been educated at *Rome*, or in the other schools and seminaries belonging to its spiritual jurisdiction. *Ils sont* (says Father SIMON) *les premiers à crier contre et à medire du Pape et des Latins. Ces Pelerins Orientaux qui viennent chez nous fourbent et abusent de notre credulité pour acheter un benefice et tourmenter les missionnaires Latins, &c.* We have still more recent and ample testimonies of the invincible hatred of the Greeks towards the Latins, in the *Preface* to COWELL's *Account of the present Greek Church*, printed at Cambridge in the year 1722.

[c] See the Life of MORINUS, which is prefixed to his *Antiquitates Eccles. Orient.* p. 37.

CENT. XVII.

The hopes of an union between the Greek and Latin churches entirely dispelled.

of engaging them, and the other Christians of the East, to embrace the communion of *Rome*, and acknowledge the supremacy and jurisdiction of its pontif. This was the chief object, that excited the ambitious zeal and employed the assiduous labour and activity of URBAN, who called to his assistance such ecclesiastics as were most eminent for their acquaintance with Greek and Oriental learning, and with the tempers, manners, and characters of the Christians in those distant regions, that they might suggest the shortest and most effectual method of bringing them and their churches under the Roman yoke. The wisest of these counsellors advised the pontif to lay it down for a preliminary in this difficult negotiation, that the Greek and Eastern Christians were to be indulged in almost every point that had hitherto been refused them by the Romish missionaries, and that no alteration was to be introduced either into their ritual or their doctrine; that their ceremonies were to be tolerated, since they did not concern the essence of religion; and that their doctrine was to be explained and understood in such a manner, as might give it a near and striking resemblance of the doctrine and institutions of the church of *Rome*. In defence of this method of proceeding, it was judiciously observed, that the Greeks would be much more tractable and obsequious, were they told by the missionaries, that it was not meant to convert them; that they had always been Roman-catholics in reality, though not in profession; and that the popes had no intention of persuading them to abandon the doctrine of their ancestors, but only desired that they would understand it in its true and genuine sense. This plan gave rise to a variety of laborious productions, in which there was more learning than probity, and more dexterity than candour and good faith. Such were the treatises published by LEO ALLATIUS, MORINUS, CLEMENT GALANUS, LUCAS HOLSTENIUS, ABRAHAM ECHELLENSIS [d], and others, who pretended to demonstrate, that there was little or no difference between the religion of the Greeks, Armenians, and Nestorians, and that of the church of *Rome*, a few ceremonies excepted, together with

[d] The book of LEO ALLATIUS, *De Concordia Ecclesiae Orientalis et Occidentalis*, is well known, and deservedly looked upon, by the most learned men among the Protestants, as the work of a disingenuous and insidious writer. The *Græcia Orthodoxa* of the same author, which was published at *Rome* in the year 1652, in 4^{to}. and contains a compilation from all the books of the Grecian doctors that were well affected to the Latin church, is still extant.—We have nothing of LUCAS HOLSTENIUS (who was superior to ALLATIUS in learning and sagacity) upon this subject, except two posthumous dissertations, *De ministro et forma sacramenti confirmationis apud Græcos*, which were published at *Rome* in the year 1666.—The treatises of MORINUS, *De pœnitentia et ordinationibus*, are known to all the learned, and seem expressly composed to make the world believe, that there is a striking uniformity of sentiment, between the Greek and Latin churches, on these two important points, when, laying aside the difference that scholastic terms and peculiar modes of expression may appear to occasion, we attend to the meaning that is annexed to these terms by the members of the two communions.—GALANUS, in a long and laborious work, published at *Rome* in the year 1650, has endeavoured to prove, that the Armenians differ very little from the Latins in their religious opinions; and ABRAHAM ECHELLENSIS has attempted to convince us in several treatises (and more especially in his *Animadversiones ad Hebed Jesu Catalogum librorum Chaldaicorum*) that all Christians throughout *Africa* and *Asia* have the same system of doctrine that is received among the Latins.

some

some unusual phrases and terms that are peculiar to the Christians of the CENT. XVII. East.

This design of bringing, by artful compliances, the Greek and Eastern churches under the jurisdiction of *Rome* was opposed by many; but by none with more resolution and zeal than by CYRILLUS LUCAR, patriarch of *Constantinople*, a man of extensive learning and knowledge of the world, who had travelled through a great part of *Europe*, and was well acquainted with the doctrine and discipline both of the Protestant and Romish churches. This prelate declared openly, and indeed with more courage than prudence, that he had a strong propensity to the religious sentiments of the English and Dutch churches, and had conceived the design of reforming the doctrine and ritual of the Greeks, and bringing them nearer to the purity and simplicity of the Gospel. This was sufficient to render the venerable patriarch odious to the friends of *Rome*. And accordingly the Jesuits, seconded by the credit and influence of the French ambassador, and assisted by the treacherous stratagems of some perfidious Greeks, continued to perplex and persecute the good man in various ways, and at length accomplished his ruin; for, by the help of false witnesses, they obtained an accusation of treason against him, in consequence of which he was put to death, in the year 1638, by the order of the emperor [e]. He was succeeded by CYRILLUS, bishop of *Berea*, a man of a dark, malignant, and violent spirit, and the infamous instrument the Jesuits had chiefly employed in bringing him to an untimely end. As this new patriarch declared himself openly in favour of the Latins, the reconciliation of the Greeks with the church of *Rome* seemed more probable than ever, nay almost certain [f]; but the dismal fate of this unworthy prelate, dispelled all of a sudden the pleasing hopes and the anxious

[e] The *Confession of Faith*, drawn up by CYRILLUS LUCAR, was published in *Holland* in the year 1645; and is also inserted by AYMON, in his *Monumens authentiques de la Religion des Grecs*, p. 237. By this confession it appears evidently, that CYRILLUS had a stronger inclination towards the doctrine of the Reformed churches, than to that which was commonly received among the Greeks. Nor was he, by any means, ill-affected towards the Lutherans; since he addressed several letters to the Swedish clergy, about this time, and solicited their friendship, as appears from the learned ARKENHOLTZ's *Memoires de la Reine CHRISTINE*, tom. i. p. 486. tom. ii. Append. p. 113.—AYMON has published, in the work already mentioned, p. 1—199. twenty seven Letters of this patriarch to the clergy of *Geneva* and to other doctors of the Reformed church, in which his religious sentiments are still more plainly discovered. His life, transactions, and deplorable fate have been recorded by THOMAS SMITH, a learned divine of the English church, in his *Narratio de vita, studiis, gestis et martyrio CYRILLI LUCARIS*, which is the third article of his *Miscellanea*, published at *London* in 8^{vo}. in the year 1686; as also by HOTTINGER, in his *Analect. Historico-Theolog. Appendic. dissert. viii.* p. 550. and by other authors mentioned by FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Græca*, vol. x. p. 499.

[f] See ELIÆ VEGELII *Defensio Exerc. de Ecclesia Græca*, p. 100. where we find the Letters of the Roman pontif URBAN VIII to CYRILLUS of *Berea*, in which he loads with applause this new patriarch, for having been so instrumental in banishing from among the Greeks the pernicious errors of CYRILLUS LUCAR, and warmly exhorts him to depose all the Greek patriarchs and bishops that are not favorable to the Latin church. These exhortations are seconded by flattering promises, and, particularly, by an assurance of protection and succour from the king of *Spain*. CYRILLUS of *Berea* died in the communion of the Romish church. See HEN. HILARII *Not. ad PHIL. CYPRII Chron. Ecclesiæ Græcæ*, p. 470.

CENT. XVII. fears with which *Rome* and its adversaries beheld the approach of this important event. The same violent death, that had concluded the days of CYRILLUS LUCAR, pursued his successor, in whose place PARTHENIUS, a zealous opposer of the doctrine and ambitious pretensions of *Rome*, was raised to the patriarchal dignity. After this period, the Roman pontiffs desisted from their attempts upon the Greek church, no favorable opportunity being offered, either of deposing its patriarchs, or gaining them over to the Romish communion.

Whether or not the Romish doctors and missionaries contributed to the corruption of the doctrine of the Greek church?

III. Notwithstanding these unsuccessful attempts of the Roman pontiffs to reduce the Greek church under their dominion, many alledge, and more especially the Reformed clergy complain, that the doctrine of that church has been manifestly corrupted by the emissaries of *Rome*. It is supposed, that, in later times, the munificence of the French ambassadors at the *Port*, and the persuasive sophistry of the Jesuits, have made such irresistible impressions on the avarice and ignorance of the Greek bishops, whose poverty is great, that they have departed, in several points, from the religious system of their ancestors, and have adopted, among other errors of the Romish church, the monstrous and unnatural doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. This change is said to have been more especially brought about in the famous council, which was assembled, in the year 1672, at *Jerusalem*, by DOSITHEUS, the patriarch of that city [g]. Without entering into an examination of the truth and equity of this charge, brought against the Greek bishops, we shall only observe, that it was the controversy between the Roman-catholics and Protestants in *France*, that first gave rise to it. The latter, and more especially JOHN CLAUDE, so justly celebrated for his extensive learning and masterly eloquence, maintained, that many of the doctrines of the Romish church, and more particularly that of *Transubstantiation*, were of a modern date, and had never been heard of before the ninth century. The Roman-catholics, on the contrary, with ARNAUD at their head, affirmed, that the doctrine of *Rome* concerning the *Eucharist*, and the real conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of CHRIST in that holy ordinance, had been received by Christians in all ages of the church [h]. To strengthen their cause further by authorities, that they imagined would have no small influence upon their adversaries, they ventured to assert, that this doctrine was adopted by all the Eastern Christians, and particularly by the Greek churches [i]. This bold assertion required

[g] See, for an account of this council, AYMON, *Memoires Authentiques de la Religion des Grecs*, tom. i. p. 263.—GISBERTI CUPERI *Epistolæ*, p. 404. 407.—See, more especially the judicious and learned observations of BASNAGE on this transactions of the council, in his *Histoire de la Religion des Eglises Reformées*, period. iv. p. i. c. xxxii. p. 452. and COWELL's *Account of the present State of the Greek Church*, book i. ch. v. p. 136.

[[h] It was to prove this most groundless assertion, that the famous NICOLE published his artful book, *De la Perpetuité de la Foi*, in the year 1664, which was answered, with a victorious force of evidence, by the learned CLAUDE.]

[i] The names and productions of the principal writers that appeared in this controversy may be found in the *Bibliotheca Græca* of FABRICIUS, vol. x. p. 444. and in the learned PFAFF's *Dissertatio contr.* LUDOV. LOGERII *Opus Eucharisticum*, published at *Tubingen* in the year 1718.

striking and authentic testimonies to give it any degree of credit. Accord-
 ingly, the ambassador of *France*, residing at *Constantinople*, received orders
 from his court to concur with the Jesuits, and to leave no methods unem-
 ployed in procuring certificates from the Greek clergy to confirm this as-
 sertion. On the other hand, the English and Dutch ambassadors, per-
 suaded that no such doctrine was really professed in the Greek church, pro-
 cured also the testimonies of several ecclesiastics, in order to take from the
 Roman-catholic disputants this pretext; which, after all, was of no great
 consequence, as it did not affect the merits of the cause. The result, how-
 ever, of this scrutiny was favorable to the Romish doctors, whose agents in
 foreign parts procured a more numerous list of testimonies, than their ad-
 versaries could produce. The Protestants invalidated these testimonies by
 proving fully, that many of them were obtained by bribery from the indi-
 gent Greeks, whose deplorable poverty made them sacrifice truth to lucre;
 and that a great number of them were drawn, by artifice, from ignorant
 priests, whom the Jesuits deceived by disguising the doctrines of *Rome* in
 such a manner, as to give them a Grecian air, and make them resemble the
 religious system of the Eastern churches [k]. Be that as it will, it may
 justly be questioned, whether the admission of certain doctrines in the Greek
 church, that resemble the errors of popery, is to be dated from the period
 now before us; and whoever examines this controversy with a spirit of im-
 partiality, accompanied with a competent knowledge of the history of the
 religious doctrine of the Greek churches, will perhaps find, that a certain
 vague and obscure notion, similar to the Romish doctrine of *Transubstan-*
tiation, has been received during many ages by many of these churches;
 though, in these latter times, they may have learnt, from the Roman mis-
 sionaries, the popish manner of expressing this monstrous and unaccountable
 tenet [l].

IV. Of those independent Greek churches, which are governed by their
 own laws, and are not subject to the jurisdiction of the patriarch of *Con-*
stantinople, there is none but the church established in *Russia* that can furnish
 any matter for an ecclesiastical historian; the rest are sunk in the most de-
 plorable ignorance and barbarity that can possibly be imagined. About the
 year 1666, a certain sect, which assumed the name of *Isbraniki*, i. e. *the*
Multitude of the Elect, but were called, by their adversaries, *Roskolsnika*, or
 the *seditionary Faction*, arose in *Russia*, and excited considerable tumults and
 commotions in that kingdom [m]. The reasons, that this sect alledges in

The Russian
church.

[k] Here, above all other histories, the reader will do well to consult COWELL's *Account of the*
present State of the Greek Church, Pref. p. 2. and also book i. ch. v. p. 136. as this author was
 actually at *Constantinople*, when this scene of fraud and bribery was carried on, and was an eye-
 witness of the insidious arts and perfidious practices employed by the Jesuits to obtain from the
 Greek priests and monks testimonies in favour of the doctrine of the Latin or Romish church.

[l] The learned LA CROZE, who cannot be suspected of any propensity to favour the cause of
Rome in general, or that of the Jesuits in particular, was of opinion that the Greeks had been long
 in possession of the foolish doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. See GIBERTI CUPERI *Epistol.* p. 37.
 44. 48. 51. 65.

[m] These, perhaps, are the same persons of whom the learned GMELIN speaks under the deno-
 mination of STEROWERZI, in the account of his *Voyage into Siberia*, tom. iv. p. 404.

CENT. XVII. defence of its separation from the Russian church, are not as yet known with any degree of certainty; nor have we any satisfactory or accurate account of its doctrines and institutions [n]; we only know, in general, that its members affect an extraordinary air of piety and devotion, and complain of the corruptions introduced into the ancient religion of the Russians, partly by the negligence, and partly by the ambition of the episcopal Order [o]. On the other hand, great pains were taken to conquer the obstinacy of this factious sect; arguments, promises, threatenings, dragoonings, the authority of synods and councils, seconded by racks and gibbets; in a word, all the methods that artifice or barbarity could suggest were practised to bring back these seditious heretics into the bosom of the church. But the effect of these violent measures by no means answered the expectations of the Russian government; they exasperated, instead of reclaiming, these schismatics, who retired into the woods and deserts, and, as it often happens, were rendered more fierce and desperate by the calamities and sufferings in which they were involved. From the time that PETER the Great ascended the throne of *Russia*, and made such remarkable changes in the form and administration both of its civil and ecclesiastical government, this faction has been treated with more humanity and mildness; but it is alledged, that these mild proceedings have, by no means, healed the schism; and that, on the contrary, the ROSKOLNIKI have gained strength, and are become still more obstinate since the period now mentioned.

The change introduced into the Russian church by Peter I.

V. It will not be improper here to give some account of this reformation of the church of *Russia*, that was owing to the active zeal and wisdom of PETER I; for though this interesting event belongs to the history of the following century, yet the scheme, by which it was brought about, was laid

[(n) This sect is called by other authors, the sect of the *Roskolniki*. According to the account of VOLTAIRE, who pretends to have drawn the materials of his *History of the Russian Empire under PETER I*, from authentic records furnished by the court of *Petersburg*, this sect made its first appearance in the twelfth century. The members of it alledge, in defence of their separation, the corruptions, both in doctrine and discipline, that have been introduced into the Russian church. They profess a rigorous zeal for the *Letter* of Holy Scripture, which they do not understand, and the transposition of a single word in a new edition of the Russian Bible, though this transposition was made to correct an uncouth phrase in the translation commonly received, threw them into the greatest combustion and tumult. They will not allow a priest to administer baptism after having tasted spirituous liquor; and in this, perhaps, they do not amiss, since it is well known that the Russian priests seldom touch the flask without drinking deep. They hold that there is no subordination of rank, no superior or inferior, among the faithful; that a Christian may kill himself for the love of CHRIST; that *Halleluiah* must be but twice pronounced, and that it is a great sin to repeat it thrice; and that a priest must never give a blessing but with three fingers. They are regular even to austerity in their manners; but as they have always refused to admit Christians of other denominations into their religious assemblies, they have been suspected of committing in them various abominations, which ought not to be believed without the strongest and most demonstrative proof. They are accused, for example, of killing a child in these assemblies and of drinking its blood, and of lascivious commerce in its most irregular forms.]

[o] See BERGIUS, *De Statu Ecclesiæ Religionis Moscoviticæ*, sect. xi. cap. vii. p. 69. sect. ii. cap. xvi. p. 218.—*Append.* 270.—HEINECCIUS's *Account of the Greek Church*, written in German, p. 30.—HAVEN's *Iter Russicum*.—Some doctors conjecture, that these *Isbraniki*, or *Roskolniki*, are a branch descended from the ancient Bogomilians, of whom we have already given some account, cent. xii. part ii. chap. v. § ii.

towards

towards the conclusion of that now before us. This great prince made no change in the articles of faith received among the Russians, and which contain the doctrine of the Greek church. But he took the utmost pains to have this doctrine explained, in a manner conformable to the dictates of right reason and the spirit of the Gospel; and he used the most effectual methods to destroy, on the one hand, the influence of that hideous superstition, that sat brooding over the whole nation; and, on the other, to dispel the ignorance of the clergy, which was incredible, and that of the people, which would have surpassed it, had that been possible. These were great and arduous undertakings; and the reformation, to which they pointed, was such as seemed to require whole ages to accomplish and bring to any tolerable degree of perfection. To accelerate the execution of this glorious plan, PETER I became a zealous protector and patron of arts and sciences. He encouraged, by various instances of munificence, men of learning and genius to settle in his dominions. He reformed the schools that were sunk in ignorance and barbarism, and erected new seminaries of learning. He endeavoured to excite in his subjects a desire of emerging from their ignorance and brutality, and a taste for knowledge and useful arts. And, to crown all these noble attempts, he extinguished the infernal spirit of persecution; abolished the penal laws against those that differed merely in religious opinion from the established church; and granted to Christians of all denominations liberty of conscience, and the privilege of performing divine worship in the manner prescribed by their respective liturgies and institutions. This liberty, however, was modified in such a prudent manner, as to restrain and defeat any attempts, that might be made by the Latins, to promote the interests of popery in *Russia*, or to extend the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, beyond the chapels of that communion, that were tolerated by law. For though Roman-catholics were allowed places for the celebration of divine worship, yet the Jesuits were not permitted to exercise the functions of missionaries or public teachers in *Russia*; and a particular charge was given to the council, to which belonged the cognizance of ecclesiastical affairs, to use their utmost care and vigilance to prevent the propagation of Romish tenets among the people.

Besides all this, a notable change was now introduced into the manner of governing the church. The splendid dignity of patriarch, which approached too near the lustre and prerogatives of majesty, not to be offensive to the emperor and burthensome to the people, was suppressed, or rather assumed, by this spirited prince, who declared himself the supreme pontif and head of the Russian church [p]. The functions of this high and important office

[p] This account is not perhaps entirely accurate. Dr. MOSHEIM seems to insinuate, that PETER assumed not only the *authority*, but also the *office* and *title* of patriarch or supreme pontif and head of the church. This however was not the case; he retained the power without the title, as may be seen by the oath that every member of the synod, he had established, was obliged to take, when he was appointed to that office. It was in consequence of his authority as *emperor* that he claimed an absolute authority in the church, and not from any ghostly character or denomination. The oath now mentioned ran thus, *I swear and promise to be a faithful and obedient sub-*
were...

CENT. XVII. were entrusted with a council assembled at *Petersburg*, which was called the *Holy Synod*, and in which one of the *archbishops*, the most distinguished by his integrity and prudence, was appointed as president. This honourable office was filled by the famous STEPHEN JAVORSKI, who composed a laborious work in the Russian language against heresy [q]. The other orders of the clergy continued in their respective rank and offices; but both their revenues and their authority were considerably diminished. It was resolved at first, in this general reformation, to abolish all monasteries and convents, as prejudicial to the community, and unfriendly to population; but this resolution was not put in execution; on the contrary, the emperor himself erected a magnificent monastery in honour of ALEXANDER NEWSKY, whom the Russians place in the list of their heroes [r].

The state of the
Monophysites.

VI. A small body of the *Monophysites* in *Asia* abandoned, for some time, the doctrine and institutions of their ancestors, and embraced the communion of *Rome*. This step was entirely owing to the suggestions and intrigues of a person, named ANDREW ACHIGIAN, who had been educated at *Rome*, where he imbibed the principles of popery, and, having obtained the title and dignity of patriarch from the Roman pontif, assumed the denomination of IGNATIUS XXIV [s]. After the death of this pretended patriarch, another usurper, whose name was PETER, aspired after the same dignity, and, taking the title of IGNATIUS XXV, placed himself in the patriarchal chair; but the lawful patriarch of the sect had credit enough with the Turks to procure the deposition and banishment of this pretender, and thus the small congregation which acknowledged his jurisdiction was entirely dispersed [t]. The African Monophysites, and more especially the *Copts*, notwithstanding that poverty and ignorance which exposed them to the seductions of sophistry and gain, stood firm in their principles, and made an obstinate resistance to the promises, presents, and attempts employed by the papal missionaries to bring them under the Roman yoke.—With respect to the *Abyssinians*, we have mentioned already, in its proper place, the revolution by which they delivered themselves from that tyrannical yoke, and resumed the liberty they had so imprudently renounced. It is proper, however, to take notice here of the zeal discovered by the Lutherans in their attempts to dispel

jeet and servant to my true and natural sovereign, and to the august successors it shall please him to appoint in consequence of the indisputable power he has to regulate the succession to the crown. I acknowledge him as the supreme judge of this spiritual college, &c. See VOLTAIRE'S Histoire de l'Empire de Russie sous Pierre le Grand, tom. i. p. 174.]

[q] LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 1295.

[r] Those, who are acquainted with either the Danish or German languages, will find several interesting anecdotes relating to these changes, in HAVEN'S *Iter Russicum*.

[s] From the fifteenth century downwards, all the patriarchs of the *Monophysites* have taken the name of IGNATIUS, and that for no other reason, than to shew that they are the lineal successors of IGNATIUS, who was bishop of *Antioch* in the first century, and of consequence the lawful patriarchs of *Antioch*. A like reason induces the religious chief of the Maronites, who also lays claim to the same dignity, to assume the name of PETER; for St. PETER is said to have governed the church of *Antioch* before IGNATIUS.

[t] Jo. SIMON. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Orientalis, Clementino-Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 482. and his *Dissert. de Monophysitis*, § iii. p. 6, 7.

the

the ignorance and superstition of this people, and to bring them to the knowledge of a purer religion and a more rational worship. It was with this pious design that the learned HEYLING, of *Lubec*, undertook a voyage into *Ethiopia* in the year 1634, where he resided many years, and acquired such a distinguished place in the favour and esteem of the emperor, that he was honoured with the high and important office of prime minister of that mighty empire. In this eminent station he gave many instances of his zeal, both for the interests of religion and the public good; after which he set out for *Europe*, but never arrived there, nor is it known in what manner or by what accident he ended his days [u].

Several years after this, ERNEST, duke of *Saxe-Gotha*, surnamed the Pious, on account of his eminent sanctity and virtue, formed the resolution of making a new attempt to spread the knowledge of the Gospel in its purity and simplicity among the ignorant and superstitious Abyssinians. This design was formed by the counsels and suggestions of the famous LUDOLPH, and was to have been executed by the ministry of abbot GREGORY, an Abyssinian, who had resided, for some time, in *Europe* [w]. The unhappy fate of this missionary, who perished in a shipwreck in the year 1657, did not totally discourage the prince from pursuing his purpose; for, in the year 1663, he entrusted the same pious and important commission with JOHN MICHAEL WANSLEB, a native of *Erfurt*, to whom he gave the wisest orders, and whom he charged particularly to leave no means unemployed that might contribute to give the Abyssinian nation a favourable opinion of the Germans, as it was upon this basis alone that the success of the present enterprize could be built. WANSLEB, however, whose virtue was by no means equal to his abilities, instead of continuing his journey to *Abyssinia*, remained several years in *Egypt*. On his return from thence into *Europe*, he began to entertain uneasy apprehensions of the account that would naturally be demanded both of his conduct and of the manner in which he had employed the sums of money he received for his Abyssinian expedition. These apprehensions rendered him desperate, because they were attended with a consciousness of guilt. Hence, instead of returning into *Germany*, he went directly to *Rome*, where, in the year 1667, he embraced, at least in outward profession, the doctrine of that church, and entered into the Dominican Order [x]. Thus the pious designs of the best of princes failed in the execution. To them, however, we are indebted for the great light, that has been thrown by the learned and laborious LUDOLPH on the history, doctrine, literature, and manners of the Abyssinians, which, before this period, were but very superficially known in *Europe*.

[u] A very curious Life of HEYLING, was published in German by Dr. MICHAELIS, at *Hall*, in 1724.—See also MOLLERI *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. i. p. 253.

[w] See LUDOLPHI *Præmium ad Comm. in Hist. Æthiop.* p. 31.—JUNCKERI *Vita JOEL LUDOLPHI*, p. 68.

[x] For an account of this inconstant and worthless, but learned man, see LOBO, *Voyage d'Abyss.* tom. i. p. 198. 227. 233. 248.—CYPRIAN, *Catalog. Mss. Biblioth. Gothanæ*, p. 64.—EUS. RENAUDOT. *Præf. ad Hist. Patriarch. Alexand.*—ECHARD and QUETIF, *Scriptor. Ordin. Prædic.* tom. ii. p. 693.—See the same authors, *Historia Ecclesiæ Alexandrinæ*.

VII. The state of the Christians in *Armenia* underwent a considerable change, soon after the commencement of this century, in consequence of the incursions of *ABBAS the Great*, king of *Persia*, into that province. This prince laid waste all that part of *Armenia* that lay contiguous to his dominions, and ordered the inhabitants to retire into *Persia*. These devastations were designed to prevent the Turks from approaching to his frontier; for the Eastern monarchs, instead of erecting fortified towns on the borders of their respective kingdoms, as is done among European princes, laid waste their borders upon the approach of the enemy, that by thus cutting off the means of their subsistence, their progress might be either entirely stopped, or considerably retarded. In this general emigration, the more opulent and better sort of the Armenians removed to *Ispahan*, the capital of *Persia*, where the generous monarch granted them a beautiful suburb for their residence, with the free exercise of their religion, under the jurisdiction of a bishop or patriarch. Under the reign of this magnanimous prince, who cherished his people with a paternal tenderness, these happy exiles enjoyed the sweets of liberty and abundance; but after his death the scene changed, and they were involved in calamities of various kinds [y]. The storm of persecution, that arose upon them, shook their constancy; many of them apostatized to the Mahometan religion, so that it was justly to be feared that this branch of the Armenian church would gradually perish. On the other hand, the state of religion in that church derived considerable advantages from the settlement of a prodigious number of Armenians in different parts of *Europe* for the purposes of commerce. These merchants, who had fixed their residence, during this century, at *London*, *Amsterdam*, *Marseilles*, and *Venice* [z], were not unmindful of the interests of religion in their native country. And their situation furnished them with favourable opportunities of exerting their zeal in this good cause; and, particularly, of supplying their Asiatic brethren with Armenian translations of the Holy Scriptures, and of other theological books, from the European presses, especially from those of *England* and *Holland*. These pious and instructive productions, being dispersed among the Armenians, who lived under the Persian and Turkish governments, contributed, no doubt, to preserve that illiterate and superstitious people from falling into the most consummate and deplorable ignorance.

VIII. The divisions, that reigned among the Nestorians in the preceding century, still subsisted; and all the methods, that had been employed to heal them, proved hitherto ineffectual. Some of the Nestorian bishops dis-

[y] See CHARDIN, *Voyages en Perse*, tom. ii. p. 106.—GABRIEL DU CHINON, *Nouvelles Relations du Levant*, p. 206.

[z] For an account of the *Armenians*, who settled at *Marseilles*, and of the books they took care to have printed in that city for the use of their brethren in foreign parts, see RICH. SIMON'S *Lettres Choiesies*, tom. ii. p. 137.—The same author, (tom. iv. p. 160.) and the learned JOHN JOACHIM SCHRODER, in a *Dissertation* prefixed to his *Thesaurus Linguae Armenicæ*, give an account of the Armenian Bible that was printed in *Holland*. The latter also takes notice of the other Armenian books that were published at *Venice*, *Lyons*, and *Amsterdam*, *loc. cit.* cap. ii. § xxv. p. 38.

covered a propensity to accommodate matters with the church of Rome. CENT. XVII.
 ELIAS II, bishop of Mosul, sent two private embassies to the pope, in the year 1607 and 1610, to solicit his friendship; and, in the letter he addressed on that occasion, to PAUL IV, declared his desire to bring about a reconciliation between the Nestorians and the Latin church [a]. ELIAS III, though at first extremely averse to the doctrine and institution of that church, changed his sentiments in this respect; and, in the year 1657, addressed a letter to the congregation *de propaganda fide*, in which he intimated his readiness to join with the church of Rome, on condition, that the pope would allow the Nestorians a place of public worship in that city, and would abstain from all attempts to alter the doctrine or discipline of that sect [b]. The Romish doctors could not but perceive that a reconciliation, founded on such conditions as these, would be attended with no advantage to their church, and promised nothing that could flatter the ambition of their pontif. And accordingly we do not find that the proposal above-mentioned was accepted. It does not appear, that the Nestorians were received, at this time, into the communion of the Romish church, or that the bishops of Mosul were, after this period, at all solicitous about the friendship or good will of the Roman pontif. The Nestorian bishops of Ormus, who successively assume the name of SIMEON, proposed also more than once [c] plans of reconciliation with the church of Rome; and, with that view, sent the Roman pontif a confession of their faith, that gave a clear idea of their religious tenets and institutions. But these proposals were little attended to by the court of Rome, which was either owing to its dislike of the doctrine of these Nestorians [d], or to that contempt, which their poverty and want of influence excited in the pontifs, whose ambition and avidity aimed at acquisitions of more consequence; for it is well known, that, since the year 1617, the bishops of Ormus have been in a low and declining state both in point of opulence and credit, and are no longer in a condition to excite the envy of their brethren at Mosul [e]. The Romish missionaries gained over, nevertheless, to their communion a handful of Nestorians, whom they formed into a congregation or church, about the middle of this century. The bishops or patriarchs of this little flock reside in the city of Amida, or Diarbeker, and all assume the denomination of JOSEPH [f]. The Nestorians, who inhabit the coasts of Malabar, and are called the Christians of St. THOMAS, suffered innumerable vexations and the most grievous persecution from the Romish priests, and more especially the Jesuits, while these settlements were in the hands of the Portuguese; but neither artifice nor violence could engage them to embrace the communion of Rome [g]. But

[a] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 543. tom. ii. p. 457. tom. iii. p. i. p. 650.

[b] ASSEMANI *loc. cit.* tom. iii. p. ii.

[c] In the years 1619 and 1653.

[d] ASSEMANI *loc. cit.* tom. i. p. 531. tom. ii. p. 457. tom. iii. p. i. p. 622.

[e] PET. STROZZA, *Præf. ad librum de Chaldaeorum dogmatibus.*

[f] See LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. ii. p. 1078.

[g] LA CROZE, *Histoire du Christianisme des Indes*, livr. v. p. 344.

CENT. XVII. when *Cochin* was taken by the Dutch, in the year 1663, and the Portuguese were driven out of these quarters, the persecuted Nestorians resumed their primitive liberty, and were re-instated in the privilege of serving God without molestation according to their consciences. These blessings they still continued to enjoy; nor are such of them as entered into the communion of *Rome* disturbed by the Dutch, who are used to treat with toleration and indulgence all sects, who live peaceably with those, who differ from them in religions, opinions, and ceremonies.

[h] SCHOUTEN, *Voyage aux Indes Orient.* tom. i. p. 319. 466.

S E C T I O N II.

P A R T II.

The HISTORY of the MODERN CHURCHES.

CHAPTER I.

The HISTORY of the LUTHERAN CHURCH.

I. **W**E have already seen [a] the calamities and vexations the Lutheran church suffered from the persecuting spirit of the Roman pontiffs, and the intemperate zeal of the house of *Austria*, which, on many occasions, shewed too great a propensity to second their ambitious and despotic measures; we shall, therefore, at present, confine our view to the losses it sustained from other quarters. The cause of Lutheranism suffered considerably by the desertion of MAURICE, Landgrave of *Hesse*, a prince of uncommon genius and learning, who not only embraced the doctrine and discipline of the *Reformed* church [b], but also, in the year 1604, removed the Lutheran professors from their places in the university of *Marpurg*, and the doctors of that communion from the churches they had in his dominions. MAURICE, after taking this vigorous step, on account of the obstinacy with which the Lutheran clergy opposed his design, took particular care to have his subjects instructed in the doctrine of the *Helvetic* church, and introduced into the *Hessian* churches the form of public worship that was observed at *Geneva*. This plan was not executed without some difficulty; but it acquired a compleat degree of stability and consistence, in the year 1619, when deputies were sent by this prince to the synod of *Dort* in *Holland*, with express orders to consent, in the name of the *Hessian* churches, to all the acts that should be passed in that assembly. The doctors of the *Reformed* church, who lived at this period, defended strenuously the measures followed by MAURICE, and maintained, that in all these transactions he observed the strictest principles of equity, and discovered an uncommon spirit of moderation. Perhaps the doctors of modern days may view this

CENT. XVII.

The Lutheran church loses ground in some places — The Hessians embrace Calvinism.

[a] In the *History of the Romish Church*. — See above.

[b] The reader must always remember that the writers of the continent generally use the denomination of *Reformed* in a limited sense, to distinguish the church of *England* and the Calvinistical churches from those of the Lutheran persuasion.]

CENT. XVII. matter in a point of light, somewhat different from this. They will acknowledge, perhaps without hesitation, that if this illustrious prince had been more influenced by the sentiments of the wisest of the Reformed doctors, concerning the conduct we ought to observe towards those who differ from us in religious matters, and less by his own will and humour, he would have ordered many things otherwise, than he actually did [c].

The new reformation takes place in Brandenburg.

II. The example of the Landgrave of *Hesse* was followed, in the year 1614, by JOHN SIGISMUND, elector of *Brandenburg*, who also renounced Lutheranism, and embraced the communion of the *Reformed* churches, though with certain restrictions, and without employing any acts of mere authority to engage his subjects in the same measure. For it is observable, that this prince did not adopt all the peculiar doctrines of Calvinism. He introduced, indeed, into his dominions the form of public worship, that was established at *Geneva*, and he embraced the sentiments of the Reformed churches, concerning the *Person* of CHRIST, and the manner in which *he is present* in the eucharist, as they appeared to him much more conformable with reason and scripture than the doctrine of the Lutherans relating to these points. But, on the other hand, he refused to admit the calvinistical doctrine of *Divine Grace* and *Absolute Decrees*; and, on this account, neither sent deputies to the synod of *Dort*, nor adopted the decisions of that famous assembly on these intricate subjects. This way of thinking was so exactly followed by the successors of SIGISMUND, that they never would allow the opinion of CALVIN, concerning the *Divine Decrees*, to be considered as the public and received doctrine, of the Reformed churches in their dominions. It must be particularly mentioned, to the honour of this wise prince, that he granted to his subjects an entire liberty in religious matters, and left it to their unrestrained and free choice, whether they would remain in the profession of Lutheranism, or follow the example of their sovereign; nor did he exclude from civil honours and employments, or from the usual marks of his protection and favour, those who continued in the favour of their ancestors. This lenity and moderation, which seemed so adapted to prevent jealousy and envy, and to satisfy both parties, did not, however, produce this natural and salutary effect; nor were they sufficient to restrain within the bounds of decency and charity several warm and inconsiderate votaries of Lutheranism. These over-zealous persons, who breathed the violent spirit of an age, in which matters of consequence were usually carried on with vehemence and rigour, looked upon it as intolerable and highly provoking,—that the Lutherans and Calvinists should enjoy the same honours and prerogatives;—that all injurious terms and odious comparisons

[c] The reader will find a more ample account of this matter in the controversial writings of the divines of *Cassel* and *Darmstadt*, published at *Cassel*, *Marpurg*, and *Giessen*, in the years 1632, 1636, 1647; and of which SALIG speaks largely in his *Hist. Aug. Confess.* tom. i. lib. iv. cap. ii. p. 756. Those, who understand the German language, may also consult GARTH'S *Historischer Bericht von dem Religions Wesen in Fürstenthum Hessen*, 1706, in 4^{to}.—CYPRIAN'S *Unterricht von Kirchlicher Vereinigung der Protestanten*, p. 263. & *Appendix*, p. 101.—As also the *Acts* published in the *Unschuldigen Nachrichten*, A. 1749, p. 25.

should be banished from religious debates;—that the controverted points in theology should either be entirely omitted in the sermons and public discourses of the clergy, or explained with a spirit of modesty and Christian charity;—that certain rites, which displeased the Calvinists, should be totally abolished;—and that they, who differed in their religious opinions, should be obliged to live in peace, concord, and the mutual exchange of good offices. If it was unreasonable in them to be offended at injunctions of this nature, it was still more so, to discover their indignation in a manner that excited, not only sharp and uncharitable debates, but also civil commotions and violent tumults, that disturbed considerably the tranquillity of the state, and nourished a spirit of sedition and revolt, which the labour of years was employed to extinguish in vain. In this troubled state of things, the divines of *Saxony*, and more especially those of *Wittemberg*, undertook to defend the Lutheran cause; but, if it be acknowledged, on the one hand, that their views were good, and their intentions upright; it must be owned, on the other, that their style was keen even to a degree of licentiousness, and their zeal warm beyond all measure. And, indeed, as it generally happens, their want of moderation hurt, instead of promoting, the cause in which they had embarked; for it was in consequence of their violent proceedings, that the *Form of Concord* was suppressed in the territories of *Brandenburg*, and the subjects of that electorate prohibited, by a solemn edict, from studying divinity in the academy of *Wittemberg* [d].

III. It was deplorable to see two churches, which had discovered an equal degree of pious zeal and fortitude in throwing off the despotic yoke of *Rome*, divided among themselves, and living in discords that were highly detrimental to the interests of religion, and the well-being of society. Hence several eminent divines and leading men, both among the Lutherans and Calvinists, sought anxiously after some method of uniting the two churches, though divided in their opinions, in the bonds of Christian charity and ecclesiastical communion. A competent knowledge of human nature and human passions was sufficient to persuade these wise and pacific mediators, that a perfect uniformity in religious opinions was not practicable, and that it would be entirely extravagant to imagine that any of these communities

Attempts made towards a union between the Lutheran and Reformed churches.

[d] The edicts of SIGISMUND and his successors, relating to this change in the state of religion in *Brandenburg*, have been several times re-published in one collection. Besides these, there are many books, treatises, and pamphlets, which give an account of this remarkable transaction, and of which the reader will find a compleat list in the German work, entitled, *Unschuldigen Nachrichten*, An. 1745, p. 34. A. 1746, p. 326, compared with JO. CAROL. KOCHER *Bibliotheca Theologiae Symbolicae*, p. 312.—The reader, who desires to attain to a perfect acquaintance with this controversy, and to be able to weigh the merits of the cause, by having a true state of the case before him, will do well to consult ARNOLDI *Histor. Eccles. et Hæret.* p. ii. lib. xvii. c. vii. p. 965.—CYPRIAN'S *Unterricht von der Vereinigung der Protestant.* p. 75. and in *Append. Monum.* p. 225.—*Unschuldige Nachrichten*, A. 1729, p. 1067. et A. 1732, p. 715.—They who affirm that the elector's ultimate end in changing the face of religion, in his dominions, was not the prospect of augmenting and extending his authority, found their opinion rather on conjecture than on demonstration; nor do they confirm this assertion by testimonies that are sufficient to bring full conviction. It must, however, be acknowledged, on the other hand, that their conjectures have neither an absurd nor an improbable aspect.

could:

CENT. XVII. could ever be brought to embrace universally, and without limitation, the doctrines of the other. They made it, therefore, their principal business to persuade those, whose spirits were inflamed with the heat of controversy,—that the points in debate between the two churches were not essential to true religion;—that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity were received and professed in both communions;—and that the difference of opinion, between the contending parties, turned either upon points of an abstruse and incomprehensible nature, or upon matters of indifference, which neither tended to render mankind wiser nor better, and in which the interests of genuine piety were in no wise concerned. Those, who viewed things in this point of light, were obliged to acknowledge, that the diversity of opinions between the two churches was, by no means, a sufficient reason for their separation; and that, of consequence, they were called by the dictates of that Gospel, which they both professed, to live not only in the mutual exercise of Christian charity, but to enter also into the fraternal bonds of church communion. The greatest part of the *Reformed* doctors seemed disposed to acknowledge, that the errors of the Lutherans were not of a momentous nature, nor of a pernicious tendency; and that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity had not undergone any remarkable alteration in that communion; and thus on their side an important step was made towards peace and union between the two churches. But the greatest part of the Lutheran doctors declared, that they could not form a like judgment with respect to the doctrine of the Reformed churches; they maintained tenaciously the importance of the points, which divided the two communions, and affirmed, that a considerable part of the controversy turned upon the fundamental principles of all religion and virtue. It is not at all surprising, that this steadiness and constancy of the Lutherans was branded, by the opposite party, with the epithets of morose obstinacy, supercilious arrogance, and such like odious denominations. The Lutherans were not behind-hand, with their adversaries, in acrimony of style; they recriminated with vehemence, and charged their accusers with instances of misconduct, different in kind, but equally condemnable. They reproached them with having dealt disingenuously, by disguising, under ambiguous expressions, the real doctrine of the Reformed churches; they observed further, that their adversaries, notwithstanding their consummate prudence and circumspection, gave plain proofs, on many occasions, that their propensity to a reconciliation between the two churches arose from views of private interest, rather than from a zeal for the public good.

Declaration of
the synod of
Charenton.

IV. Among the public transactions relative to the project of a union between the *Reformed* and *Lutheran* churches, we must not omit mentioning the attempt made by JAMES I, king of *Great-Britain*, to accomplish this salutary purpose, in the year 1615. The person employed, for this end, by the British monarch, was PETER DU MOULIN, the most eminent among the Protestant doctors in *France* [e]; but this design was neither carried on

[e] See LE VASSOR, *Hist. de Louis XIII*, tom. ii. p. ii. p. 21.

with spirit, nor attended with success [f]. Another attempt of the same pacific nature was made in the year 1631, in the synod of *Charenton*, in which an act was passed by the Reformed doctors of that respectable assembly, declaring the Lutheran system of religion conformable with the spirit of true piety, and free from pernicious and fundamental errors. By this act, a fair opportunity was offered to the Lutherans of joining with the Reformed church upon honourable terms, and of entering into the bonds both of civil and religious communion with their calvinistical brethren [g]. But this candid and charitable proceeding was attended with very little fruit, since few of the Lutherans were disposed to embrace the occasion that was here so freely offered them of terminating the dissensions that separated the two churches. This same year, a conference was held at *Leipsic* between the Saxon doctors HOE, LYSER, and HOPFNER, on the one side, and some of the most eminent divines of *Hesse-Cassel* and *Brandenburg* on the other; to the end, that, by exposing with fidelity and precision their respective doctrines, it might be more easily seen, what the real obstacles were, that stood in the way of the union projected between the two churches. This conference was conducted with decency and moderation, and the deliberations were neither disturbed by intemperate zeal nor by a proud spirit of contention and dispute; but that openness of heart, that mutual trust and confidence, which are so essential to the success of all kinds of pacification, were wanting here. For though the doctors of the Reformed party exposed, with the utmost precision and fairness, the tenets of their church, and made, moreover, many concessions, which the Lutherans themselves could scarcely expect; yet the latter, suspicious and fearful, and always apprehensive of schemes, formed by artifice under the mask of candour, to betray and ensnare them, did not dare to acknowledge, that they were satisfied with these explications and offers; and thus the conference broke up without having contributed, in any respect, to promote the salutary work of peace [h]. To form a true idea of these pacific deliberations, of the reasons that gave rise to them, and of the principles by which they were conducted, it will be necessary to study the civil history of this interesting period with attention and care.

V. ULADISLAUS IV., king of *Poland*, formed a still more extensive plan of religious union than those hitherto mentioned; he proposed a reconciliation, not only between the Reformed and Lutheran churches, but also

The conferences
at *Tborn* and
Cassel.

[(f) King JAMES, who would have abandoned the most important and noble design, at any time, to discuss a point of grammar or theology, or to gain a point of interest for himself or his minions, neglected this union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, which he had begun to promote with such an appearance of piety and zeal.]

[g] BENOIT, *Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes*, tom. ii. p. 544.—AYMON, *Actes des Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Reformees de France*, tom. ii. p. 500.—ITTIGH *Dissert. de Synodi Carentonienfis indulgentia erga Lutheranos*, Lips. 1705, 489.

[h] TIMANNI GESSELI *Historia Sacra et Ecclesiastica*, p. ii. in addendis, p. 597—613. in which the Acts of this conference are published.—JO. WOLFG. JAEGERI *Historia Saeculi xvii*, Decenn. iv, p. 497. [This testimony of Dr. MOSHEIM, who was himself a Lutheran, is singularly honourable to the Reformed doctors.]

between.

CENT. XVII. between these two communions and that of *Rome*. For this purpose, he ordered a conference to be held at *Thorn* in the year 1645, the issue of which, as might naturally have been expected, was far from being favourable to the projected union; for the persons, employed by the three churches, to heal their divisions, or at least to calm their animosities, returned from this conference with a greater measure of party-zeal, and a smaller portion of Christian charity, than they had brought to it.

The conference held at *Cassel*, in the year 1661, by the order of WILLIAM VI, Landgrave of *Hesse*, between MUSÆUS and HENICHIUS, professors at *Rintelen*, on the side of the Lutherans, and CURTIUS and HEINIUS of the university of *Marpurg*, on that of the Reformed, was attended with much more success; and, if it did not bring about a perfect uniformity of opinion, it produced, what was much better, a spirit of Christian charity and forbearance. For these candid doctors, after having diligently examined the nature, and weighed the importance, of the controversies that divided the two churches, embraced each other with reciprocal marks of affection and esteem, and mutually declared, that their respective doctrines were less different from each other, than was generally imagined; and that this difference was not of sufficient moment to prevent their fraternal union and concord. But it happened unluckily, that these moderate doctors of *Rintelen* could not infuse the same spirit of peace and charity that animated *them*, into their Lutheran brethren, nor persuade them to view the difference of opinion, that divided the Protestant churches in the same indulgent point of light in which they had considered them in the conference at *Cassel*. On the contrary, this their moderation drew upon them the hatred of almost all the Lutherans; and they were loaded with bitter reproaches in a multitude of pamphlets, that were composed expressly to refute their sentiments, and to censure their conduct [i]. The pains that were taken after this period by the princes of the house of *Brandenburg*, and more especially by FREDERIC WILLIAM, and his son FREDERIC, in order to compose the dissensions and animosity that divide the Protestants, and, particularly, to promote a fraternal union between the Reformed and Lutheran churches in the Prussian territories, and in the rest of their dominions, are well known: and it is also equally notorious, that innumerable difficulties were formed against the execution of this salutary design.

The pacific exploits of John Dureau.

VI. Besides these public conferences, held by the authority of princes, in order to promote union and concord among Protestants, a multitude of individuals, animated by a spirit of true Christian charity, embarked in this pious cause on their own private authority, and offered their mediation and

[i] The writers, who have given accounts of the conferences of *Thorn* and *Cassel*, are enumerated by SAGITTARIUS, in his *Introd. ad Hist. Ecclesiast.* tom. ii. p. 1604.—See also JAEGERI *Historia Sæculi xvii*, Decenn. v, p. 689. and Decenn. vii, p. 160. where the *Acts* of the conferences of *Cassel* and *Thorn* are extant.—Add to these JO. ALPHONS. TURRETINI *Nubes Testium pro moderato in rebus Theologicis judicio*, p. 178.—There is an ample account of the conference of *Cassel* in the Life of MUSÆUS, given by MOLLERUS in his *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 566. The reader will find in the same work an accurate *Index* of the *Account* of this conference published on both sides.

good offices to reconcile the two churches. It is true, indeed, that these peace-makers were, generally speaking, of the Reformed church; and that those, among the Lutherans, who appeared in this amiable character, were but few, in comparison with the great number of Calvinists that favoured this benevolent, but arduous design. The most eminent of the calvinistical peace-makers was JOHN DUREUS, a native of *Scotland*, and a man justly celebrated on account of his universal benevolence, solid piety, and extensive learning; but, at the same time, more remarkable for genius and memory, than for nicety of discernment and accuracy of judgment, as might be evinced by several proofs and testimonies, were this the proper place for discussions of that nature. Be that as it will, never perhaps was there such an example of zeal and perseverance as that exhibited by DUREUS, who, during the space of forty years [k], suffered vexations and underwent labours, which required the firmest resolution, and the most inexhaustible patience; wrote, exhorted, admonished, entreated, and disputed; in a word, tried every method that human wisdom could suggest, to put an end to the dissensions and animosities that reigned among the Protestant churches. For it was not merely by the persuasive eloquence of his pen, or by forming plans in the silence of the closet, that this worthy divine performed the task which his benevolence and zeal engaged him to undertake; his activity and industry were equal to his zeal; he travelled through all the countries in *Europe* where the Protestant religion had obtained any footing; he formed connexions with the doctors of both parties; he addressed himself to kings, princes, magistrates, and ministers; and by representing, in lively and striking colours, the utility and importance of the plan he had formed, hoped to engage them more or less in this good cause, or at least to derive some succour from their influence and protection. But here his views were considerably disappointed; for though his undertaking was generally applauded, and though he met with a favorable and civil reception from the greatest part of those to whom he addressed himself, yet he found very few who were seriously disposed to alleviate his labours, by lending him their assistance, and seconding his attempts by their influence and counsels. Nay some, suspecting that the fervent and extraordinary zeal of DUREUS, arose from mysterious and sinister motives, and apprehending, that he had secretly formed a design of drawing the Lutherans into a snare, attacked him in their writings with animosity and bitterness, and loaded him with the sharpest invectives and reproaches. So that this well-meaning man, neglected at length by those of his own communion, opposed and rejected by the followers of LUTHER, involved in various perplexities and distress, exhausted by unsuccessful labour, and oppressed and dejected by injurious treatment, perceived, by a painful experience, that he had undertaken a task, which was beyond the power of a private person, and spent the remainder of his days in repose and obscurity at *Cassel* [l].

[k] From the year 1631 to 1674.

[l] See COLERI *Historia* JOH. DURÆI, published in 4^{to} at *Wittemberg* in 1716, to which however many important additions might be made from public records, and also from documents that

CENT. XVII.

It may not be improper to observe here, that DUREUS, who, notwithstanding the uprightness of his intentions in general, was sometimes deficient in frankness and ingenuity, had annexed to his plan of reconciliation certain doctrines, which, were they susceptible of proof, would serve as a foundation for the union, not only of the Lutherans and Calvinists, but also of all the different sects that bear the Christian name. For, among other things, he maintained, that the *Apostle's Creed* was a compleat body of divinity; the *Ten Commandments* a perfect system of morals; and the *Lord's Prayer* a comprehensive series of petitions for all the blessings contained in the divine promises. Now, if this notion, that these sacred compositions contain all that is essential to faith, obedience, and devotion, had been universally entertained or evidently demonstrated, it would not have been a chimerical project to aim at a reconciliation of all Christian churches upon this basis, and to render these compositions the foundation of their coalition and the bond of their union. But it would have been highly chimerical to expect, that the Christian sects would universally adopt this notion, or be pleased to see the doctrines of Christianity reduced to such general principles. It is further to be observed, with respect to DUREUS, that he shewed a peculiar propensity towards the sentiments of the *Mystics* and *Quakers*, on account of their tendency to favour his conciliatory and pacific project. Like them, he placed the essence of religion in the *ascent* of the soul to God, in calling forth the *hidden word*, in fanning the *divine spark* that resides in the recesses of the human mind, and, in consequence of this system, was intimately persuaded, that differences, merely in theological opinions, did not at all concern the essence of true piety.

Matthiæ and
Calixtus.

VII. Those among the Lutherans, that appeared the most zealous in this pacific cause, were JOHN MATTHIÆ [m], bishop of *Strengnes*, in *Sweden*, and GEORGE CALIXTUS, professor of divinity at *Helmstadt*, whom DUREUS had animated with a portion of his charitable and indulgent spirit. The former was a man of capacity and merit; and the latter was eminently distinguished, among the doctors of this century, by his learning, genius, probity,

have not, as yet, seen the light. Some records and documents, of the kind here referred to, have been published by HASÆUS, in his *Bibliotheca Bremens. Theologico-Philologica*, tom. i. p. 911. and tom. iv. p. 683. a still greater number are given by GESSELIUS, in the *Addenda Irenica*, that are subjoined to his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, tom. ii. p. 614. The transactions of DUREUS at *Marpurg* are mentioned by SCHENK, in his *Vitæ Professorum Theologiæ Marburg.* p. 202.—His attempts in *Holstein* may be learned from the letters of LACKMAN and LOSSIUS, which are joined together in the same volume. His exploits in *Prussia* and *Poland* are recorded by JABLONSKY, in his *Historia Consensus Sendomiriensis*, p. 127. and his labours in *Denmark*, the *Palatinate*, and *Switzerland* are mentioned respectively by ELSWICH, in his *Fasciculus Epistol. Theolog.* p. 147.—SEELÉN'S *Deliciæ Epistol.* p. 353. and in the *Museum Helvet.* tom. iii, iv, v.—See also JÆGERI *Historia Sæculi xvii*, Decenn. vii, p. 171,—BOHMIUS, *Englische Reformations Historie*, and more especially an account of DUREUS, published under my direction at *Helmstadt*, in the year 1744, by BENZELIUS, and entitled, *Dissertatio de JOHAN. DURÆO, maxime de Actis ejus Suecanis*. This Dissertation contains a variety of anecdotes drawn from records, not yet made public.

[(m) MATTHIÆ had been chaplain to GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS, and was afterwards appointed, by that prince, preceptor to his daughter CHRISTINA, so famous in history, on account of the whimsical peculiarities of her character, her taste for learning, and her desertion of the Swedish throne and the Protestant religion.]

and candour; but they both failed in the arduous undertaking in which they had engaged, and suffered considerably in their attempts to promote the cause of union and concord. The *Olive-branches* [n] of MATTHIÆ, who entitled thus his pacific productions, were, by a royal edict, publicly condemned and suppressed in *Sweden*; and their author, in order to appease the fury of his enemies, was obliged to resign his bishopric, and pass the rest of his days in retirement [o]. The zeal of CALIXTUS, in calming the tumultuous and violent spirit of the contending parties, drew upon him the bitterest reproaches, and the warmest animosity and resentment from those, who were more bent on maintaining their peculiar opinions, than in promoting that charity which is the end of the commandment; and while he was labouring to remove all sects and divisions, he appeared to many of his brethren in the light of a new sectary, who was founding the most pernicious of all sects, even that of the *Syncretists*, who were supposed to promote peace and concord at the expence of truth. We shall, before we finish this chapter, endeavour to give a more particular and circumstantial account of the sentiments and trials of this great man, to whose charge many other things were laid, besides the *crime* of endeavouring to unite the disciples of the same master in the amiable bonds of charity, concord, and mutual forbearance; and whose opinions and designs excited warm contests in the Lutheran church.

VIII. The external state of the Lutheran church at this period was attended with various circumstances of prosperity, among which we may reckon its standing firm against the assaults of *Rome*, whose artifice and violence were, in vain, employed to bring on its destruction. It is well known, that a very considerable number of Lutherans resided in those provinces, where the public exercise of their religion was prohibited. It has, more especially, been shewn, by the late memorable emigration of the *Saltzburgers* [p], that still greater numbers of them lay concealed in that land of despotism and bigotry, where the smallest dissent from popery, with whatever secrecy and circumspection it may be disguised, is considered as an enormous and capital crime; and that they preserved their religious sentiments and doctrines pure and uncorrupted amidst the contagion of Romish superstition, which they always beheld with aversion and horror. In those countries, which are inhabited by persons of different communions, and whose sovereigns are members of the Romish church, we have numberless instances of the cruelty and injustice practised by the papists against those that dissent from them; and these cruelties are exercised under a pretext suggested by the most malevolent bigotry, which represents these dissenters as seditious subjects, and consequently as worthy of the most rigorous

The prosperous events that happened to the Lutheran church.

[(n) *Rami Olivæ Septentrionalis.*]

[o] See SCHEFFERI *Suecia Litterata*, p. 123. and JOH. MOLLERI ad eam *Hypomnemata*, p. 317.

—ARKENHOLTZ, *Memoires de la Reine CHRISTINE*, tom. i. p. 320. 505. tom. ii. p. 63.

[(p) For an account of the persecuted Lutherans in the archbishoprick of *Saltzburg*, see BURNET'S *Travels*. See more especially a famous Latin discourse, published at *Tubingen* in the year 1732, under the following title: *Commentariolus Theologicus de non tolerandis in Religione Dissidentibus, quem Præsides CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFIO defendet WOLF. LUD. LEISCHING.*]

CENT. XVII. treatment. And yet it is certain, that, amidst all these vexations, the Lutheran church has stood its ground; nor has either the craft or fury of its enemies been able, any where, to deprive it entirely of its rights and privileges. It may further be observed, that the doctrine of LUTHER was carried into *Asia*, *Africa*, and *America*, by several persons, who fixed their habitation in those distant regions, and was also introduced into some parts of *Europe*, where it had hitherto been unknown.

The progress of
learning among
the Lutherans.

IX. When we turn our view to the internal state of the Lutheran church during this century, we shall find it improved in various respects; though several blemishes yet remained, that clouded its lustre. It must be acknowledged, to the honour of the Lutherans, that they cultivated all the various branches of literature, both sacred and profane, with uncommon industry and success, and made several improvements in the sciences, which are too well known to stand in need of a particular mention; and of which a circumstantial enumeration would be inconsistent with the brevity we propose to observe in this history. But, if it cannot be denied, on the one hand, that the cause of religion gained by these improvements in learning, it must be owned, on the other, that some branches of science were perverted, by injudicious or ill-designing men, to corrupt the pure simplicity of genuine Christianity, and to render its doctrines abstruse and intricate. Thus it too often happens in life, that the best things are the most egregiously abused.

About the commencement of this century the sciences, chiefly cultivated in the schools, were logic and metaphysics; though the manner of treating them was almost entirely destitute of elegance, simplicity, and precision. But, in process of time, the scene changed in the seminaries of learning, and the more entertaining and agreeable branches of literature, that polish wit, excite taste, exercise judgment, and enrich memory, such as civil and natural history, philology, antiquities, criticism, and eloquence, gained the ascendant. Both these kinds of knowledge acquired also a more graceful, consistent, and regular form than that under which they had hitherto appeared. But it happened, most unluckily, that, while the boundaries of science were extended from day to day, and new discoveries and improvements were constantly enriching the republic of letters, the credit of learning began sensibly to decrease, and learned men seemed gradually to lose those peculiar marks of veneration and distinction, that the novelty of their character, as well as the excellence and importance of their labours, had hitherto drawn from the public. Among the various circumstances that contributed to this decline of literary glory, we may particularly reckon the multitude of those, who, without natural capacity, taste, or inclination, were led, by authority or a desire of applause, to literary pursuits; and, by their ignorance or their pedantry, cast a reproach upon the republic of letters.

The state of phi-
losophy.

The Aristotelians
triumph.

X. The only kind of philosophy that was taught in the Lutheran schools, during the greatest part of this century, was that of ARISTOTLE, dressed up in that scholastic form that increased its native intricacy and subtilty. And such was the devout and excessive veneration entertained by many for this abstruse

abstruse system, that any attempt to reject the Grecian oracle, or to correct its decisions, was looked upon as of the most dangerous consequence to the interests of the church, and as equally criminal with a like attempt upon the sacred writings. Those, who distinguished themselves in the most extraordinary manner by their zealous and invincible attachment to the Peripatetic philosophy, were the divines of *Leipsic, Tubingen, Helmstadt, and Altorf*. The enchantment, however, was not universal; and there were many, who, withdrawing their private judgment from the yoke of authority, were bold enough to see with their own eyes; and, of consequence, discerned the blemishes that were, indeed, sufficiently visible in the pretended wisdom of the Grecian sage. The first attempt to reduce his authority within narrow bounds was made by certain pious and prudent divines, who, though they did not pretend to discourage all philosophical inquiries, yet were desirous of confining them to a few select subjects; and complained, that the pompous denomination of philosophy was too frequently prostituted, by being applied to unintelligible distinctions and words, or rather sounds, destitute of sense [q]. These were succeeded in their dislike of the Peripatetic philosophy by the disciples of RAMUS, who had credit enough to banish it from several seminaries of learning, and to substitute, in its place, the system of their master, which was of a more practical kind, and better adapted to the purposes of life [r]. But, if the philosophy of ARISTOTLE met with adversaries, who opposed it upon solid and rational principles, it had also enemies of a very different character, who imprudently declaimed against philosophy in general, as highly detrimental to the cause of religion and the interests of society. Such was the fanatical extravagance of DANIEL HOFFMAN, professor at *Helmstadt*, who discovered, in this controversy, an equal degree of ignorance and animosity; and such also were the followers of ROBERT FLUDD, JACOB BEHMEN, and the Rosicrucians, who boasted of having struck out, by the assistance of *fire and divine illumination*, a new, wonderful, and celestial system of philosophy, of which mention has been already made [s]. These adversaries of the stagirite were divided among themselves, and this diminished the strength and vigour of their opposition to the common enemy. But, had they been ever so closely united in their sentiments and measures, they would not have been able to overturn the empire of ARISTOTLE, which was deeply rooted in the schools through long possession, and had a powerful support in the multitude of its votaries and defenders.

XI. The Peripatetic system had still more formidable adversaries to encounter in DES CARTES and GASSENDI, whose writings were composed with that perspicuity and precision that rendered them singularly agreeable to many of the Lutheran doctors of this century, and made them look with

The freedom of philosophical inquiry gains ground.

[q] Such, among others, was WENCESLAS SCHILLINGIUS, of whom a particular account is given by ARNOLD, in his *Histor. Eccles. et Hæret.* p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. vi.

[r] See JO. HERMAN AB ELSWICK, *De varia Aristotelis fortuna*, § xxi. p. 54. and WALCHIUS, *Historia Logices*, lib. ii. cap. ii. sect. iii. § v. in *Parergis ejus Academicis*, p. 613.

[s] See above in the *General History of the Church*, § xxxi.

CENT. XVII. contempt on that obsolete and barren philosophy of the schools, which was expressed in uncouth terms and barbarous phrases, without taste, elegance, or accuracy. The votaries of ARISTOTLE beheld, with envy, these new philosophers; used their most zealous endeavours to bring them into discredit; and, for this purpose, represented their researches and principles as highly detrimental to the interests of religion and the growth of true piety. But when they found, by experience, that these methods of attack proved unsuccessful, they changed their manner of proceeding; and, like a prudent general, who, besieged by a superior force, abandons his out-works, and retires into the citadel, they relinquished much of their jargon, and defended only the main and essential principles of their system. To render these principles more palatable, they began to adorn them with the graces of elocution, and to mingle with their philosophical tenets the charms of polite literature. They even went so far as to confess, that ARISTOTLE, though the prince of philosophers, was chargeable with errors and defects, which it was both lawful and expedient to correct. But these concessions only served to render their adversaries more confident and enterprising, since they were interpreted as resulting from a consciousness of their weakness, and were looked upon as a manifest acknowledgment of their defeat. In consequence of this, the enemies of the stagirite renewed their attacks with redoubled impetuosity, and with a full assurance of victory; nor did they confine them to those branches of the Peripatetic philosophy, which were allowed by its votaries to stand in need of correction, but levelled them, without distinction, at the whole system, and aimed at nothing less than its total dissolution. GROTIUS, indeed, who marched at the head of these philosophical reformers, proceeded with a certain degree of prudence and moderation. PUFFENDORF, in treating of the law of nature and of the duties of morality, threw off, with more boldness and freedom, the Peripatetic yoke, and pursued a method entirely different from that which had been hitherto observed in the schools. This freedom drew upon him a multitude of enemies, who, loaded him with the bitterest reproaches; his example was, nevertheless, followed by THOMASIVS, professor of law in the academy of *Leipfic*, and afterwards at *Hall*, who attacked the Peripatetics with new degrees of vehemence and zeal. This eminent man, though honourably distinguished by the excellence of his genius and the strength of his resolution, was not, perhaps, the properest person that could be pitched upon to manage the interests of philosophy. His views, nevertheless, were vast; he aimed at the reformation of philosophy in general, and of the Peripatetic system in particular; and he assiduously employed both the power of exhortation and the influence of example in order to persuade the Saxons to reject the Aristotelian system which he had never read, and which, most certainly, he did not understand. The scheme of philosophy, that he substituted in its place, was received with little applause, and soon sunk into oblivion; but his attempt to overturn the system of the Peripatetics, and to restore the freedom of philosophical inquiry, was attended with remarkable success, made, in a little time, the most rapid progress, and produced such
admirable

admirable effects, that THOMASIVS is justly looked upon, to this day, as the chief of those bold spirits, who pulled down philosophical tyranny from its throne in *Germany*, and gave a mortal blow to what was called the *Sectarian Philosophy* [*t*] in that country. The first seminary of learning that adopted the measures of THOMASIVS was that of *Hall* in *Saxony*, where he was professor; they were afterwards followed by the rest of the German schools, by some sooner, by others later, and from thence a spirit of philosophical liberty began to spread itself in other countries, where the Lutheran religion was established. So that, towards the conclusion of this century, the Lutherans enjoyed a perfect liberty of conducting their philosophical researches in the manner they judged the most conformable with truth and reason, of departing from the mere dictates of authority in matters of science, and of proposing publicly every one his respective opinions. This liberty was not the consequence of any positive decree of the state, nor was it inculcated by any law of the church; it seemed to result from that invisible disposal of things, which we call accident, and certainly proceeded from the efforts of a few great men, seconding and exciting that natural propensity towards free inquiry that can never be totally extinguished in the human mind. Many employed this liberty in extracting, after the manner of the ancient *Eclectics*, what they thought most conformable to reason and most susceptible of demonstration, from the productions of the different schools, and connecting these extracts in such a manner, as to constitute a complete body of philosophy. But some made a yet more noble use of this inestimable privilege, by employing, with indefatigable zeal and industry, their *own* faculties in the investigation of truth, and building upon solid and unchangeable principles a new and sublime system of philosophy. At the head of these we may place LEIBNITZ, whose genius and labours have deservedly rendered his name immortal [*u*].

In this conflict between the reformers of philosophy and the votaries of ARISTOTLE, the latter lost ground from day to day, and his system, in consequence of the extremes that reformers often fall into, grew so disgusting and odious, that condemnation was passed on every part of it. Hence the science of *Metaphysics*, which the Grecian sage had considered as the master-science, as the original fountain of all true philosophy, was spoiled of its honours, and fell into contempt; nor was the authority and influence, even of DES CARTES (who also set out, in his inquiries, from metaphysical principles) sufficient to support it against the prejudices of the times. However, when the first heat of opposition began to cool, and the rage of party to subside, this degraded science was not only recalled from its exile, by the interposition and credit of LEIBNITZ, but was also reinstated in its former dignity and lustre.

[*t*] By the *Sectarian Philosophers* were meant those, who followed implicitly some one of the ancient philosophical sects, without daring to use the dictates of their private judgment to correct or modify the doctrines or expressions of these hoary guides.]

[*u*] The curious reader will find an accurate and ample account of this revolution in philosophy, in the learned BRUCKER's *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*.

CENT. XVII.

The virtues and
defects of the
Lutheran doctors.

XII. The defects and vices of the Lutheran clergy have been circumstantially exposed and even exaggerated by many writers, who seem to require in the ministers of the Gospel a degree of perfection, which ought, indeed, always to be aimed at, but which no wise observer of human nature can ever hope to see generally reduced to practice. These censurers represent the leading men of the Lutheran church as arrogant, contentious, despotic, and uncharitable; as destitute of Christian simplicity and candour; fond of quibbling and dispute; judging of all things by the narrow spirit of party; and treating with the utmost antipathy and aversion those that differ from them ever so little in religious matters. The less considerable among the Lutheran doctors were charged with ignorance, with a neglect of the sacred duties of their station, and with a want of talent in their character as public teachers. And the whole body were accused of avarice, laziness, want of piety, and corruption of manners.

It will be acknowledged, without difficulty, by those, who have studied with attention and impartiality the genius, manners, and history of this century, that the Lutheran clergy are not wholly irreproachable with respect to the matters that are here laid to their charge, and that many Lutheran churches were under the direction of pastors who were highly deficient, some in zeal, others in abilities, many in both, and consequently ill qualified for propagating the truths of Christianity with wisdom and success. But this reproach is not peculiarly applicable to the seventeenth century; it is a general charge that, with too much truth, may be brought against all the ages of the church. On the other hand, it must be acknowledged, by all such, as are not blinded by ignorance or partiality, that the whole of the Lutheran clergy did not consist of these unworthy pastors; and that many of the Lutheran doctors of this century were distinguished by their learning, piety, gravity, and wisdom. Nay, perhaps it might be difficult to decide, whether in our times, in which some pretend, that the sanctity of the primitive doctors is revived in several places, there be not as many, that do little honour to the pastoral character, as in the times of our ancestors? It must further be observed, that many of the defects, which are invidiously charged upon the doctors of this age, were, in a great measure, owing to the infelicity of the times. They were the unhappy effects of those public calamities, which a dreadful war of thirty years duration produced in *Germany*; they derived strength from the influence of a corrupt education, and were sometimes encouraged by the protection and countenance of vitious and profligate magistrates.

The vices of the
Lutheran clergy
partly owing to
the times in
which they
lived.

XIII. That the vices of the Lutheran clergy were partly owing to the infelicity of the times, will appear evident from some particular instances. It must be acknowledged, that, during the greatest part of this century, neither the discourses of the pulpit nor the instructions of the schools were adapted to promote, among the people, just ideas of religion, or to give them a competent knowledge of the doctrines and precepts of the Gospel. The eloquence of the pulpit, as some ludicrously and too justly represent it, was reduced, in many places, to the noisy art of bawling (during a certain
space

space of time measured by a sand-glass) upon various points of theology, which the orators understood but very little, and which the people did not understand at all; and when the important doctrines and precepts of Christianity were introduced in these public discourses, they were frequently disfigured by tawdry and puerile ornaments, wholly inconsistent with the spirit and genius of the divine wisdom that shines forth in the Gospel, and were thus, in a great measure, deprived of their native beauty, efficacy, and power. All this must be confessed; but perhaps it may not appear surprising when all things are duly considered. The ministers of the Gospel had their heads full of sonorous and empty words, of trivial distinctions and metaphysical subtilties, and very ill furnished with that kind of knowledge, that is adapted to touch the heart and to reform the life; they had also few models of true eloquence before their eyes, and therefore it is not much to be wondered, if they dressed out their discourses with foreign and tasteless ornaments.

The charge brought against the universities, that they spent more time in subtle and contentious controversy, than in explaining the holy Scriptures, teaching the duties of morality, and promoting a spirit of piety and virtue; though too just, yet may be alleviated by considering the nature and circumstances of the times. The Lutherans were surrounded with a multitude of adversaries, who obliged them to be perpetually in a posture of defence; and the Roman-catholics, who threatened their destruction, contributed, in a more particular manner, to excite in their doctors that polemic spirit, which unfortunately became a habit, and had an unhappy influence on the exercise both of their academical and pastoral functions. In time of war, the military art not only becomes singularly respectable, but is preferred, without hesitation, before all others, on account of its tendency to maintain the inestimable blessings of liberty and independance; and thus, in the midst of theological commotions, the spirit of controversy, by becoming necessary, gains an ascendant, which, even when the danger is over, it is unwilling to lose. It were indeed, ardently to be wished, that the Lutherans had treated with more mildness and charity those who differed from them in religious opinions, and had discovered more indulgence and forbearance towards such, more especially, as, by ignorance, fanaticism, or excessive curiosity, were led into error, without pretending, nevertheless, to disturb the public tranquillity by propagating their particular systems. But they had unhappily imbibed a spirit of persecution in their early education; this was too much the spirit of the times; and it was even a leading maxim with our ancestors, that it was both lawful and expedient to use severity and force against those whom they looked upon as heretics. This maxim was derived from *Rome*; and even those, who separated from that church, did not find it easy to throw off, all of a sudden, that despotic and uncharitable spirit, that had so long been the main spring of its government, and the general characteristic of its members. Nay, in their narrow views of things, their very piety seemed to suppress the generous movements of fraternal love and forbearance; and the more they felt them-

CENT. XVII. selves animated with a zeal for the divine glory, the more difficult did they find it to renounce that ancient and favourite maxim, which had so often been ill interpreted and ill applied, that *whoever is found to be an enemy to God, ought also to be declared an enemy to his country* [w].

The ecclesiastical laws and polity of the Lutherans.

XIV. There were few or no changes introduced, during this century, into the form of government, the method of worship and the external rites and ceremonies of the Lutheran church. Many alterations would, indeed, have been made in all these, had the princes and states of that communion judged it expedient to put in execution the plans, that had been laid by THOMASIVS and other eminent men, for reforming its ecclesiastical polity. These plans were built upon a new principle, which supposed that the majesty and supreme authority of the sovereign was the only source of church power. On this fundamental principle, which these great men took all imaginable pains to prove by solid and striking arguments, they raised a voluminous system of laws, which, in the judgment of many, evidently tended to this conclusion: that the same sovereign who presides in the state ought to rule in the church; that prince and pontif are inseparable characters; and that the ministers of the Gospel are not the ambassadors of the Deity, but the deputies or vice-gerents of the civil magistrate. These reformers of Lutheranism did not stop here; they reduced within narrower bounds the few privileges and advantages, that the clergy yet retained, and treated many of the rites, institutions, and customs of our church as the remains of popish superstition. Hence an abundant source of contention was opened, and a long and tedious controversy was carried on with warmth and animosity between the clergy and civilians. We leave others to determine with what views these debates were commenced and fomented, and with what success they were respectively carried on by the contending parties. We shall only observe, that their effects and consequences were unhappy, as, in many places, they proved, in the issue, detrimental to the reputation of the clergy, to the dignity and authority of religion, and to the peace and prosperity of the Lutheran church [x]. The present state of that church verifies too plainly this observation. It is now its fate to see few entering into its public service, who are adapted to restore the reputation it has lost, or to maintain that which it yet retains. Those, who are distinguished by illustrious birth, uncommon genius, and a liberal and ingenuous turn of

[(w) It were to be wished that the Lutherans had not, in many places, persevered in these severe and despotic principles longer than other Protestant churches. Until this very day, the Lutherans of Frankfort on the *Maine* have always refused to permit the *Reformed* to celebrate public worship within the bounds, or even in the suburbs, of that city. Many attempts have been made to conquer their obstinacy in this respect, but hitherto without success.]

[(x) It has been the ill hap even of well-designing men to fall into pernicious extremes in the controversies relating to the foundation, power, and privileges of the church. Too few have steered the middle way, and laid their plans with such equity and wisdom as to maintain the sovereignty and authority of the *state*, without reducing the *church* to a mere creature of civil policy. The reader will find a most interesting view of this nice and important subject, in the learned and ingenious bishop of Gloucester's *Alliance between Church and State*, and in his *Dedication* of the second volume of his *Divine Legation of Moses*, to my Lord MANSFIELD.]

mind, look upon the study of theology, which has so little external honours and advantages to recommend it, as below their ambition; and hence the number of wise, learned, and eminent ministers grows less considerable from day to day. This circumstance is deeply lamented by those among us, who consider with attention the dangerous and declining state of the Lutheran church; and it is to be feared, that our descendants will have reason to lament it still more bitterly.

XV. The eminent writers, that adorned the Lutheran church through the course of this century, were many in number. We shall only mention those, whom it is most necessary for a student of ecclesiastical history to be more particularly acquainted with; such are ÆGIDIUS and NICHOLAS HUNNIUS — LEONARD HUTTER — JOSEPH and JOHN ERNESTI GERHARD — GEORGE and FREDERIC ULRIC CALIXTUS — the MENTZER'S — the OLEARIUS'S — FREDERIC BALDWIN — ALBERT GRAWER — MATTHIAS HOE — the CARP-ZOVIUS'S — JOHN and PAUL TARNOVIUS — JOHN AFFELMAN — EILHART LUBER — the LYSERS — MICHAEL WALTHER — JOACHIM HILDEBRAND — JOHN VALENTINE ANDREAS — SOLOMON GLASSIUS — ABRAHAM CALOVIUS — THEODORE HACKSPAN — JOHN HULSEMAN — JACOB WELLER — PETER and JOHN MAUSÆUS brothers — JOHN CONRAD DANHAVER — JOHN GEORGE DORSCHÆUS — JOHN ARNDT — MARTIN GEYER — JOHN ADAM SCHERTZER — BALTHAZAR and JOHN MEISNER — AUGUSTUS PFEIFFER — HENRY and JOHN MULLER — JUSTUS CHRISTOPHER SCHOMER — SEBASTIAN SCHMIDT — CHRISTOHER HORSHOLT — the OSIANDER'S — PHILIP JACOB SPENER — GEB. THEODORE MEYER — FRIDEM. BECHMAN — and others [y].

The most eminent Lutheran writers.

XVI. The doctrine of the Lutheran church remained entire during this century; its fundamental principles received no alteration, nor could any doctor of that church, who should have presumed to renounce or invalidate any of those theological points, that are contained in the *symbolical books* of the Lutherans, have met with toleration and indulgence. It is, however, to be observed, that, in later times, various circumstances contributed to diminish, in many places, the authority of these *symbolical* oracles, which had so long been considered as an almost infallible rule of faith and practice. Hence arose that unbounded liberty, which is, at this day, enjoyed by all who are not invested with the character of public teachers, of dissenting from the decisions of these *symbols*, or creeds, and of declaring this dissent in the manner they judge the most expedient. The case was very different in former times: whoever ventured to oppose any of the received doctrines of the church, or to spread new religious opinions among the people, was called before the higher powers to give an account of his conduct, and very rarely escaped without suffering in his fortune or reputation, unless he renounced his innovations. But the teachers of novel doctrines had nothing to apprehend, when, towards the conclusion of this century, the Lutheran churches adopted that leading maxim of the Arminians, that *Christians were account-*

An historical view of the religious doctrine of the Lutherans.

[y] For an account of the lives and writings of these authors, see WITTE'S *Memoriae Theologorum*, and his *Diarium Biographicum*; as also PIPPINGIUS, GOEZIUS, and other writers of literary history.

CENT. XVII. *able to God alone for their religious sentiments; and that no individual could be justly punished, by the magistrate, for his erroneous opinions, while he conducted himself like a virtuous and obedient subject, and made no attempts to disturb the peace and order of civil society.* It were to be wished, that this religious liberty, which the dictates of equity must approve, but of which the virtuous mind alone can make a wise and proper use, had never degenerated into that unbridled licentiousness, that holds nothing sacred, but with an audacious insolence tramples under foot the solemn truths of religion, and is constantly endeavouring to throw contempt upon the respectable profession of its ministers.

Sacred philology
cultivated among
the Lutherans.

XVII. The various branches of sacred erudition were cultivated with uninterrupted zeal and assiduity among the Lutherans, who, at no period of time, were without able commentators and learned and faithful guides for the interpretation of the holy Scriptures. It is natural to mention here TARNOVIUS, GERHARD, HACKSPAN, CALIXTUS, ERASMUS SCHMIDT, to whom might be added a numerous list of learned and judicious expositors of the sacred oracles. But what appears more peculiarly worthy of observation, is, that the very period, which some look upon as the most barren of learned productions, and the most remarkable for a general attention to the branch of erudition now under consideration, produced that inestimable and immortal work of SOLOMON GLASSIUS, which he published under the title of *Sacred Philology*, and than which none can be more useful for the interpretation of Scripture, as it throws an uncommon degree of light upon the language and phraseology of the inspired writers. It must, at the same time, be candidly acknowledged, that a considerable part of this century was more employed, by the professors of the different universities, in defending with subtilty and art the peculiar doctrines of the Lutheran church, than in illustrating and explaining the holy Scripture, which is the only genuine source of divine truth. Whatever was worthy of censure in this manner of proceeding was abundantly repaired by the more modern divines of the Lutheran communion. For no sooner did the rage of controversy begin to subside, than the greatest part of them turned their principal studies towards the exposition and illustration of the sacred writings, and they were particularly animated in the execution of this laborious task by observing the indefatigable industry of those among the Dutch divines, who, in their interpretations of Scripture, followed the sentiments and method of COCCÆIUS. At the head of these modern commentators we may place, with justice, SEBASTIAN SCHMIDT, who was, at least, the most laborious and voluminous expositor of this age. After this learned writer, may be ranked CALOVIUS, GEIER, SCHOMER, and others of inferior note [z]. The contests excited by the persons called *Pietists*, though unhappy, in several respects, were nevertheless attended with this good effect, that they engaged many to apply themselves to the study of the holy Scriptures, which they had too much neglected before that period, and to the perusal of the commentators and interpreters of the sacred oracles. These commentators pur-

[z] See J. FRANC. BUDÆI *Uagoge in Theologiam*, lib. ii. cap. viii. p. 1686.

fused various methods, and were unequal both in their merit and success. Some confined themselves to the signification of the words of Scripture, and the literal sense that belonged to the phrases of the inspired writer; others applied their expositions of Scripture to the decision of controverted points, and attacked their adversaries either by refuting their false interpretations of Scripture, or by making use of their own commentaries to overturn their doctrines; a third sort, after unfolding the sense of Scripture, applied it carefully to the purposes of life and the direction of practice. We might mention another class of interpreters, who, by an assiduous perusal of the writings of the Cocceians, are said to have injudiciously acquired their defects, as appears by their turning the sacred history into allegory, and seeking rather the more remote and mysterious sense of Scripture, than its obvious and literal signification. CENT. XVII.

XVIII. The principal doctors of this century followed, at first, the loose method of deducing their theological doctrine from Scripture under a few general heads. This method had been observed, in ancient times, by MELANCTHON, and was vulgarly called *Common-Place* divinity. They, however, made use of the principles, terms, and subtle distinctions of the Peripatetic philosophy, which was yet in high reputation, in explaining and illustrating each particular doctrine. The first person that reduced theology into a regular system, and gave it a truly scientific and philosophical form, was GEORGE CALIXTUS, a man of great genius and erudition, who had imbibed the spirit of the Aristotelian school. His design, in general, was not so much censured as the particular method he followed, and the form he gave to his theological system; for he divided the whole science of divinity into three parts, *viz.* the *end*, the *subject*, the *means*; and this division, which was borrowed from ARISTOTLE, appeared extremely improper to many. This philosophical method of ranging the truths of Christianity was followed with remarkable zeal and emulation by the most eminent doctors in the different schools of learning, and even in our times it has its votaries. Some indeed had the courage to depart from it and to exhibit the doctrines of religion under a different, though still under a scientific, form; but they had few followers, and struggled in vain against the empire of ARISTOTLE, who reigned with a despotic authority in the schools.

The Didactic theology—or articles of faith adopted by the Lutherans.

There were, however, many pious and good men, who beheld with great displeasure this irruption of metaphysics into the sphere of theology, and never could be brought to relish this philosophical method of teaching the doctrines of Christianity. They earnestly desired to see divine truth freed from captious questions and subtleties, delivered from the shackles of an imperious system, and exhibited with that beautiful simplicity, perspicuity, and evidence, in which it appears in the sacred writings. Persons of this turn had their wishes and expectations, in some measure, answered, when, towards the conclusion of this century, the learned SPENER, and others animated by his exhortations and example, began to inculcate the truths and precepts of religion in a more plain and popular manner, and when the eclectics had succeeded so far, as to dethrone ARISTOTLE, and to banish his philosophy,

CENT. XVII. philosophy from the greatest part of the Lutheran schools. SPENER was not so far successful as to render universal his popular method of teaching theology; it was nevertheless adopted by a considerable number of doctors; and it cannot be denied, that, since this period, the science of divinity, delivered from the jargon of the schools, has assumed a more liberal and graceful aspect. The same observation may be applied to controversial productions; it is certain, that polemics were totally destitute of elegance and perspicuity so long as ARISTOTLE reigned in the seminaries of learning, and that they were, more or less, embellished and improved since the suppression and disgrace of the Peripatetic philosophy. It is, however, to be lamented, that controversy did not lose, at this period, all the circumstances, that had so justly rendered it displeasing, and that the defects, that had given such offence in the theological disputants of all parties, were far from being entirely removed. These defects still subsist, though perhaps in a less shocking degree; and whether we peruse the polemic writers of ancient or modern times, we shall find too few among them, who may be said to be animated by the pure love of truth, without any mixture of pride, passion, or partiality, and whom we may pronounce free from the illusions of prejudice and self-love.

The state of
moral science
among the Lu-
therans.

XIX. The science of morals, which must ever be esteemed the *master-science* from its immediate influence upon life and manners, was, for a long time, neglected among the Lutherans. If we except a few eminent men, such as ARNDT and GERHARD, who composed some popular treatises concerning the internal worship of the Deity and the duties of Christians, there did not appear, during the greatest part of this century, any moral writer of distinguished merit. Hence it happened, that those, who applied themselves to the business of resolving, what are called *Cases of Conscience*, were held in high esteem, and their other tribunals much frequented. But as the true principles and foundations of morality were not, as yet, established with a sufficient degree of precision and evidence, their decisions were often erroneous, and they were liable to fall into daily mistakes. CALIXTUS was the first who separated the objects of faith from the duties of morality, and exhibited the latter under the form of an independent science. He did not, indeed, live to finish this work, the beginning of which met with universal applause; his disciples however employed, with some degree of success, the instructions they had received from their master, in executing his plan and composing a system of *Moral Theology*. This system, in process of time, fell into discredit, on account of the Peripatetic form under which it appeared; for, notwithstanding the striking repugnance that there is, in the very nature of things, between the beautiful science of Morals and the perplexing intricacies of Metaphysics, CALIXTUS could not abstain from the latter in building his Moral system. The moderns, however, stripped morality of this Peripatetic garment. Calling to their assistance the law of nature, which had been explained and illustrated by PUFFENDORF and other authors, and comparing this law with the sacred writings, they not only discovered the true springs of Christian virtue, and entered into the true spirit and
sense

sense of the divine laws, but also digested the whole science of Morals into a better order, and demonstrated its principles with a new and superior degree of evidence. CENT. XVII.

XX. These improvements in theology and morality did not diffuse such a spirit of concord in the Lutheran church, as was sufficient to heal ancient divisions, or to prevent new ones. That church, on the contrary, was involved in the most lamentable commotions and tumults during the whole course of this century, partly by the controversies, that arose among its most eminent doctors, and partly by the intemperate zeal of violent reformers, the fanatical predictions of pretended prophets, and the rash measures of innovators, who studiously spread among the people new, singular, and, for the most part, extravagant opinions. The controversies, that divided the Lutheran doctors, may be ranged under two classes, according to their different importance and extent, as some of them involved the whole church in tumult and discord, while others were less universal in their pernicious effects. Of the former class there were two controversies, that gave abundant exercise to the Polemic talents of the Lutheran doctors during the greatest part of this century, and these turned upon the religious systems that are generally known under the denominations of *Syncretism* and *Pietism*. Nothing could be more amiable than the principles that gave rise to the former, and nothing more respectable and praise-worthy than the design that was proposed by the latter. The *Syncretists* [a], animated with that fraternal love and that pacific spirit, which JESUS CHRIST had so often recommended as the peculiar characteristics of his true disciples, used their warmest endeavours to promote union and concord among Christians; and the *Pietists* had, undoubtedly, in view the restoration and advancement of that holiness and virtue, that had suffered so much by the influence of licentious manners on the one hand, and by the turbulent spirit of controversy on the other. These two great and amiable virtues, that gave rise to the projects and efforts of the two orders of persons now mentioned, were combated by a third, even a zeal for maintaining the truth, and preserving it from all mixture of error. Thus the love of truth was unhappily found to stand in opposition with the love of union, piety, and concord; and thus, in this present critical and corrupt state of human nature, the unruly and turbulent passions of men can, by an egregious abuse, draw the worst consequences from the best things, and render the most excellent principles and views productive of confusion, calamity, and discord.

Commotions and
contests in the
Lutheran church.

XXI. The origin of *Syncretism* was owing to GEORGE CALIXTUS of *Sleswick*, a man of eminent and distinguished abilities and merit, and who had few equals in this century either in point of learning or genius. This great man being placed in a university [b] which, from the very time of its foundation, had been remarkable for encouraging freedom of inquiry, improved this happy privilege, examined the respective doctrines of the

The rise of the
Syncretistical or
Calixtine con-
troversies.

[a] The *Syncretists* were also called *Calixtines* from their chief, GEORGE CALIXTUS; and *Helmstadians* from the university, where their plan of doctrine and union took its rise.

[b] The university of *Helmstadt*, in the duchy of *Brunswick*, founded in the year 1576.

CENT. XVII. various sects that bear the Christian name, and found, in the notions commonly received among divines, some things defective and erroneous. He accordingly gave early intimations of his dissatisfaction with the state of theology, and lamented, in a more particular manner, the divisions and factions that reigned among the servants and disciples of the same great master. He therefore turned his views to the salutary work of softening the animosities produced by these divisions, and shewed the warmest desire not so much of establishing a perfect harmony and concord between the jarring sects, which no human power seemed capable of effecting, as of extinguishing the hatred, and appeasing the resentment, which the contending parties discovered too much in their conduct towards each other. His colleagues did not seem at all averse to this pacific project; and the surprize, that this their silence or acquiescence must naturally excite in such as are acquainted with the theological spirit of the seventeenth century, will be diminished, when it is considered, that the professors of divinity at *Helmstadt* bind themselves, at their admission, by an oath to use their best and most zealous endeavours to heal the divisions and terminate the contests that prevail among Christians. Neither CALIXTUS however nor his friends escaped the opposition, that it was natural to expect in the execution of such an unpopular and comprehensive project. They were warmly attacked, in the year 1639, by STATIUS BUSCHERUS, a Hanoverian ecclesiastic, a bigoted votary of RAMUS, a declared enemy to all philosophy, and a man of great temerity and imprudence. This man, exasperated at the preference CALIXTUS and his companions had given to the Peripatetic philosophy over the principles of the *Ramists*, composed a very malignant book, entitled, *Crypto-Papismus novæ Theologiæ Helmstadiensis* [c], in which CALIXTUS was charged with a long list of errors. Though this production made some small impression on the minds of certain persons, it is nevertheless probable, that BUSCHER would have, almost universally, passed for a partial, malicious, and rash accuser, had his invectives and complaints rendered CALIXTUS more cautious and prudent. But the upright and generous heart of this eminent man, which disdained dissimulation to a degree that bordered upon the extreme of imprudence, excited him to speak with the utmost frankness his private sentiments; and thus to give a certain measure of plausibility to the accusations of his adversary. Both he and his colleague CONRAD HORNEIUS maintained with boldness and perseverance several propositions, which appeared, to many others beside BUSCHER, new, singular, and of a dangerous tendency; and CALIXTUS more especially, by the freedom and plainness with which he declared and defended his sentiments, drew upon him the resentment and indignation of the Saxon doctors, who, in the year 1645, were present at the conference of *Thorn*. He had been chosen by FREDERIC WILLIAM, elector of *Brandenburg*, as colleague and assistant to the divines he sent from *Koningsberg* to these conferences; and the Saxon deputies were greatly incensed to see a Lutheran ecclesiastic in the character of an assistant

[c] i. e. *Popery disguised under the mask of the new theological system of Helmstadt.*

to a deputation of Reformed doctors. This first cause of offence was followed by other incidents, in the course of these conferences, which increased the resentment of the Saxons against CALIXTUS, and made them accuse him of leaning to the side of the Reformed churches. We cannot enter here into a circumstantial account of this matter, which would lead us from our main design. We shall only observe, that when these conferences broke up, the Saxon doctors, and more especially HULSEMAN, WELLER, SCHARFIUS, and CALOVIUS, turned the whole force of their Polemic weapons against CALIXTUS; and, in their public writings, reproached him with apostasy from the principles of Lutheranism, and with a propensity towards the sentiments both of the Reformed and Romish churches. This great man did not receive tamely the insults of his adversaries. His consummate knowledge of the philosophy that reigned in the schools, and his perfect acquaintance with the history of the church, rendered him an able disputant; and, accordingly, he repelled, with the greatest vigour, the attacks of his enemies; and carried on, with uncommon spirit and erudition, this important controversy, until the year 1656, when death put an end to his labours, and transported him from these scenes of dissension and tumult into the regions of peace and concord [d].

XXII. Neither the death of CALIXTUS, nor the decease of his principal adversaries, were sufficient to extinguish the flame they had kindled; on the contrary, the contest was carried on, after that period, with more animosity and violence than ever. The Saxon doctors, and more especially CALOVIUS, insulted the ashes and attacked the memory of this great man with unexampled bitterness and malignity; and, in the judgment of many eminent and worthy doctors, who were by no means the partisans of CALIXTUS, conducted themselves with such imprudence and temerity, as were every way adapted to produce an open schism in the Lutheran church. They drew up a new kind of Creed, or confession of the Lutheran faith [e], which they proposed to place in the class of what the members of our communion call their *Symbolical Books*, and which, of consequence, all professors

The continuation
and issue of these
debates.

[d] Those who desire to be more minutely acquainted with the particular circumstances of this famous controversy, the titles and characters of the books published on that occasion, and the doctrines that produced such warm contests and such deplorable divisions, will do well to consult WALCHIUS, CAROLUS, WEISMAN, ARNOLD, and other writers; but above all, the third volume of the *Cimbria Litterata* of MOLLERUS, p. 121, in which there is an ample account of the life, transactions, and writings of CALIXTUS. But if any reader should push his curiosity still further, and be solicitous to know the more secret springs that acted in this whole affair, the remote causes of the events and transactions relating to it, the spirit, views, and characters of the disputants, the arguments used on both sides; in a word, those things that are principally interesting and worthy of attention in controversies of this kind, he will find no history, that will satisfy him fully in these respects. A history, that would throw a proper light upon these important matters, must be composed by a man of great candour and abilities, by one who knows the world, has studied human nature, is furnished with materials and documents, that lie as yet concealed in the cabinets of the curious, and is not unacquainted with the spirit that reigns and the cabals that are carried on in the courts of princes. But were such an historian to be found, I question very much, whether, even in our times, he could publish without danger all the circumstances of this memorable contest.

[e] The title of this new Creed was *Consensus repetiti Fidei vere Lutherane*.

CENT. XVII. of divinity and all candidates for the ministry would be obliged to subscribe, as containing the true and genuine doctrine of the Lutheran church. By this new production of intemperate zeal, the friends and followers of CALIXTUS were declared unworthy of the communion of that church; and were, accordingly, supposed to have forfeited all right to the privileges and tranquillity that were granted to the Lutherans by the laws of the empire. The reputation of CALIXTUS found, nevertheless, some able defenders, who pleaded his cause with modesty and candour; such were TITIUS, HILDEBRAND, and other ecclesiastics, who were distinguished from the multitude by their charity, moderation, and prudence. These good men shewed, with the utmost evidence, that the new Creed, mentioned above, would be a perpetual source of contention and discord, and would thus have a fatal effect upon the true interests of the Lutheran church; but their counsels were over-ruled, and their admonitions neglected. Among the writers, who opposed this Creed, was FREDERIC ULRIC CALIXTUS, who was not destitute of abilities, though much inferior to his father in learning, genius, and moderation. Of those that stood forth in its vindication and defence, the most considerable were CALOVIVS and STRAUCHIUS. The polemic productions of these contending parties were multiplied from day to day, and yet remain as deplorable monuments of the intemperate zeal of the champions on both sides of the question. The invectives, reproaches, and calumnies, with which these productions were filled, shewed too plainly that many of these writers, instead of being animated with the love of truth and a zeal for religion, were rather actuated by a keen spirit of party, and by the suggestions of vindictive pride and vanity. These contests were of long duration; they were, however, at length suspended, towards the close of this century, by the death of those who had been the principal actors in this scene of theological discord, by the abolition of the Creed that had produced it, by the rise of new debates of a different nature, and by other circumstances of inferior moment, which it is needless to mention.

The opinions of
Calixtus.

XXIII. It will be proper to give here, some account of the accusations that were brought against CALIXTUS by his adversaries. The principal charge was, his having formed a project, not of uniting into one ecclesiastical body, as some have understood it, the Romish, Lutheran, and Reformed churches, but of extinguishing the hatred and animosity, that reigned among the members of these different communions, and joining them in the bonds of charity, mutual benevolence and forbearance. This is the project, which was at first condemned, and is still known under the denomination of *Syncretism* [f]. Several singular opinions were also laid to the

[f] It is neither my design nor my inclination to adopt the cause of CALIXTUS; nor do I pretend to maintain, that his writings and his doctrines are exempt from error. But the love of truth obliges me to observe, that it has been the ill hap of this eminent man to fall into the hands of bad interpreters; and that even those who imagine they have been more successful than others in investigating his true sentiments, have most grievously misunderstood them. CALIXTUS is commonly supposed to have formed the plan of a *formal reconciliation* of the Protestants with the church of Rome and its pontiffs; but this notion is entirely groundless, since he publicly and expressly declared, that the Protestants could by no means enter into the bonds of concord and communion charge

charge of this great man, and were exaggerated and blackened, as the most innocent things generally are, when they pass through the *medium* of malignity and party-spirit. Such were his notions concerning the *obscure manner* in which the doctrine of the Trinity was revealed under the Old Testament dispensation; the appearances of the Son of God during that period; the *necessity* of good works to the attainment of everlasting salvation; and God's being *occasionally* [g] the author of sin. These notions, in the esteem of many of the best judges of theological matters, have been always looked upon as of an indifferent nature, as opinions, which, even were they false, do not affect the great and fundamental doctrines of Christianity. But the two great principles that CALIXTUS laid down as the foundation and ground-work of all his reconciling and pacific plans, gave much more offence than the plans themselves, and drew upon him the indignation and resentment of many. Those principles were: First, that *the fundamental doctrines of Christianity* (by which he meant those elementary principles from whence all its truths flow) *were preserved pure and entire in all the three communions, and were contained in that ancient form of doctrine, that is vulgarly known by the name of the Apostle's Creed.* And, secondly, that *the tenets and*

with the Romish church, as it was constituted at this time; and that, if there had ever existed any prospect of healing the divisions that reigned between it and the Protestant churches, this prospect had entirely vanished since the council of *Trent*, whose violent proceedings and tyrannical decrees had rendered the union, now under consideration, absolutely impossible. He is further charged with having either approved or excused the greatest part of those errors and superstitions, that are looked upon as a dishonour to the church of *Rome*; but this charge is abundantly refuted, not only by the various treatises, in which he exposed the falshood and absurdity of the doctrines and opinions of that church, but also by the declarations of the Roman-catholics themselves, who acknowledge that CALIXTUS attacked them with much more learning and ingenuity than had been discovered by any other Protestant writer*. It is true, he maintained that the Lutherans and Roman-catholics did not differ about the *fundamental doctrines* of the Christian faith; and it were to be wished, that he had never asserted any such thing, or, at least, that he had expressed his meaning in more proper and inoffensive terms. It must however be considered, that he always looked upon the popes and their votaries, as having *adulterated* these fundamental doctrines with an impure mixture or addition of many opinions and tenets, which no wise and good Christian could adopt; and this consideration diminishes a good deal the extravagance of an assertion, which, otherwise, would deserve the severest censure. We shall not enter further into a review of the imputations that were cast upon CALIXTUS by persons, more disposed to listen to his accusers, than to those, who endeavour with candour and impartiality to represent his sentiments and his measures in their true point of view. But if it should be asked here, what this man's real design was? we answer, that he laid down the following maxims: First, *that, if it were possible to bring back the church of Rome to the state in which it was during the first five centuries, the Protestants would be no longer justified in rejecting its communion:* Secondly, *that the modern members of the Romish church, though polluted with many intolerable errors, were not all equally criminal; and that such of them, more especially, as sincerely believed the doctrines they had learned from their parents or masters, and by ignorance, education, and the power of habit were hindered from perceiving the truth, were not to be excluded from salvation, nor deemed heretics, provided they gave their assent to the doctrines contained in the Apostle's Creed, and endeavoured seriously to govern their lives by the precepts of the Gospel.* I do not pretend to defend these maxims, which seem, however, to have many patrons in our times; I would only observe, that the doctrine they contain is much less intolerable than that which was commonly imputed to CALIXTUS.

[g] *Per accidens.*

* BOSSUET, in his *Traité de la Communion sous les deux Eſpèces*, p. i. § ii. p. 12. speaks thus of the eminent man now under consideration: *Le fameux GEORGE CALIXTE, le plus habile des Lutheriens de notre tems, qui a écrit le plus de ſévérité contre nous, &c.*

CENT. XVII. *opinions; which had been constantly received by the ancient doctors during the first five centuries, were to be considered as of equal truth and authority with the express declarations and doctrines of scripture.* The general plan of CALIXTUS was founded upon the *first* of these propositions; and he made use of the *second* to give some degree of plausibility to certain Romish doctrines and institutions, which have been always rejected by the protestant church; and to establish a happy concord between the various Christian communions that had hitherto lived in the state of dissension and separation from each other.

Debates carried
on with the doc-
tors of Rintelen
and Koningberg,

XXIV. The divines of *Rintelen*, *Koningberg*, and *Jena*, were more or less involved in these warm contests. Those of *Rintelen*, more especially HENICHIUS and MUSÆUS, had, on several occasions, and particularly at the conference of *Cassel*, shewn plainly that they approved of the plan of CALIXTUS for removing the unhappy discords and animosities, that reigned among Christians, and that they beheld with peculiar satisfaction that part of it that had for its object union and concord among the Protestant churches. Hence they were opposed with great animosity by the Saxon doctors and their adherents, in various polemic productions [b].

The pacific spirit of CALIXTUS discovered itself also at *Koningberg*. JOHN LATERMANN, MICHAEL BEHMIUS, and the learned CHRISTOPHER DREYER, who had been the disciples of that great man, were at little pains to conceal their attachment to the sentiments of their master. By this discovery, they drew upon them the resentment of their colleagues JOHN BEHMIUS and CELESTINE MISLENTA, who were seconded by the whole body of the clergy of *Koningberg*; and thus a warm controversy arose, which was carried on, during many years, in such a manner as did very little honour to either of the contending parties. The interposition of the civil magistrate, together with the decease of BEHMIUS and MISLENTA, put an end to this intestine war, which was succeeded by a new contest of long duration between DREYER and his associates on the one side, and several foreign divines on the other, who considered the system of CALIXTUS as highly pernicious, and looked upon its defenders as the enemies of the church. This new controversy was managed, on both sides, with as little equity and moderation, as those which preceded it [i].

and those of
Jena.

XXV. It must, at the same time, be acknowledged, to the immortal honour of the divines of *Jena*, that they discovered the most consummate prudence and the most amiable moderation in the midst of these theological debates. For though they confessed ingenuously, that the sentiments of CALIXTUS were not of such a nature, as that they could be all adopted without exception, yet they maintained, that the greatest part of his tenets

[b] See ABRAH. CALOVII *Historia Syncretistica*, p. 618.—JO. GEORGII WALCHII *Introductio in controversias Lutheran.* vol. i. p. 286.

[i] See CHRISTOPHER HARTKONCH'S *Church-History of Prussia* (written in German) book ii. chap. x. p. 602.—MOLERI *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. iii. p. 150.—See also the *Acts and Documents* contained in the famous collection, entitled, *Unsculdige Nachrichten*, A. 1740, p. 144. A. 1742, p. 29. A. 1745, p. 91.

were much less pernicious than the Saxon doctors had represented them; and that several of them were innocent, and might be freely admitted without any danger to the cause of truth. SOLOMON GLASSIUS, an ecclesiastic, renowned for the mildness of his temper, and the equity of his proceedings, examined with the utmost candour and impartiality the opposite sentiments of the doctors that were engaged in this important controversy, and published the result of this examination, by the express order of ERNEST, prince of *Saxe-Gotha*, surnamed the *Pious* [k]. MUSÆUS, a man of superior learning and exquisite penetration and judgment, adopted so far the sentiments of CALIXTUS as to maintain, that *good works* might, in a certain sense, be considered as *necessary to salvation*; and that of the erroneous doctrines imputed to this eminent man, several were of little or no importance. It is very probable, that the followers of CALIXTUS would have willingly submitted this whole controversy to the arbitration of such candid and impartial judges. But this laudable moderation offended so highly the Saxon doctors, that they began to suspect the academy of *Jena* of several erroneous opinions, and marked out MUSÆUS, in a particular manner, as a person who had, in many respects, apostatized from the true and orthodox faith [l].

XXVI. These debates were suppressed and succeeded by new commotions that arose in the church, and are commonly known under the denomination of the *Pietistical Controversy*. This controversy was owing to the zeal of a certain set of persons, who, no doubt with pious and upright intentions, endeavoured to stem the torrent of vice and corruption, and to reform the licentious manners both of the clergy and the people. But as the best things may be abused, so this reforming spirit inflamed persons that were but ill qualified to exert it with wisdom and success. Many, deluded by the suggestions of an irregular imagination, and an ill-informed understanding, or guided by principles and views of a still more criminal nature, spread abroad new and singular opinions, false visions, unintelligible maxims, austere precepts, and imprudent clamours against the discipline of the church; all which excited the most dreadful tumults, and kindled the flames of contention and discord. The commencement of *Pietism* was indeed laudable and decent. It was set on foot by the pious and learned SPENER, who, by the private societies he formed at *Frankfort* with a design to promote vital religion, roused the lukewarm from their indifference, and excited a spirit of vigour and resolution in those who had been satisfied to lament, in silence, the progress of impiety. The remarkable effect of these

The rise of the controversy relating to *Pietism*.

[k] This piece, which was written in German, did not appear in public till after the death of GLASSIUS, in the year 1662; a second edition of it was published in 8^{vo} at *Jena*, some years ago. The piece exhibits a rare and shining instance of theological moderation; and is worthy of a serious and attentive perusal.

[l] For an account of the imputations cast upon the divines of *Jena*, and more especially on MUSÆUS, see a judicious and solid work of the latter, entitled, *Der Jenischen Theologen Öffentliche Erklärung*, &c.—See also JO. GEORGII WALCHII *Introductio in Controversias Ecclesiae Lutheranae*, vol. i. p. 495.

CENT. XVII. pious meetings was increased by a book published, by this well-meaning man, under the title of *Pious Desires*, in which he exhibited a striking view of the disorders of the church, and proposed the remedies that were proper to heal them. Many persons of good and upright intentions were highly pleased both with the proceedings and writings of SPENER, and indeed, the greatest part of those, who had the cause of virtue and practical religion truly at heart, applauded the designs of this good man, though an apprehension of abuses retained numbers from encouraging them openly. These abuses actually happened. The remedies proposed by SPENER to heal the disorders of the church fell into unskillful hands, were administered without sagacity or prudence, and thus, in many cases, proved to be worse than the disease itself. The religious meetings abovementioned (or the *Colleges of Piety*, as they were usually called by a phrase borrowed from the Dutch) tended in many places to kindle in the breasts of the multitude the flames of a blind and intemperate zeal, whose effects were impetuous and violent, instead of that pure and rational love of God, whose fruits were benign and peaceful. Hence complaints arose, against these institutions of *Pietism*, as if, under a striking appearance of sanctity, they led the people into false notions of religion, and fomented, in those who were of a turbulent and violent character, the seeds and principles of mutiny and sedition.

The commotions
at *Leipfic*.

XXVII. These first complaints would have been undoubtedly hushed, and the tumults they occasioned would have subsided by degrees, had not the contests that arose at *Leipfic*, in the year 1689, added fuel to the flame. Certain pious and learned professors of philosophy, and particularly FRANCKIUS, SCHADIUS, and PAULUS ANTONIUS, the disciples of SPENER, who at that time was ecclesiastical superintendant of the court of *Saxony*, began to consider with attention the defects that prevailed in the ordinary method of instructing the candidates for the ministry; and this review persuaded them of the necessity of using their best endeavours to supply what was wanting, and to correct what was amiss. For this purpose they undertook to explain in their colleges certain books of holy Scripture, in order to render these genuine sources of religious knowledge better understood, and to promote a spirit of practical piety and vital religion in the minds of their hearers. The novelty of this method drew attention, and rendered it singularly pleasing to many; accordingly, these lectures were much frequented, and their effects were visible in the lives and conversations of several persons, whom they seemed to inspire with a deep sense of the importance of religion and virtue. Whether these first effusions of religious fervor, which were, in themselves, most certainly laudable, were always kept within the strict bounds of reason and discretion, is a question not easily decided. If we are to believe the report of common fame, and the testimonies of several persons of great weight, this was by no means the case; and many things were both said and done in these *Biblical Colleges* (as they were called), which, though they might be looked upon, by equitable and candid judges, as worthy of toleration and indulgence, were, nevertheless, contrary to custom, and far from being consistent with prudence. Hence

Hence rumours were spread, tumults excited, animosities kindled, and the matter at length brought to a public trial, in which the pious and learned men abovementioned were, indeed, declared free from the errors and heresies that had been laid to their charge, but were, at the same time, prohibited from carrying on the plan of religious instruction they had undertaken with such zeal. It was during these troubles and divisions that the invidious denomination of *Pietists* was first invented; it may, at least, be affirmed, that it was not commonly known before this period. It was at first applied by some giddy and inconsiderate persons to those who frequented the *Biblical Colleges*, and lived in a manner suitable to the instructions and exhortations that were addressed to them in these seminaries of piety. It was afterwards made use of to characterize all those, who were either distinguished by the excessive austerity of their manners, or who, regardless of *truth* and *opinion*, were only intent upon *practice*, and turned the whole vigour of their efforts towards the attainment of religious feelings and habits. But as it is the fate of all those denominations by which peculiar sects are distinguished, to be variously and often very improperly applied, so the title of *Pietists* was frequently given, in common conversation, to persons of eminent wisdom and sanctity, who were equally remarkable for their adherence to truth and their love of piety; and, not seldom, to persons whose motley characters exhibited an enormous mixture of profligacy and enthusiasm, and who deserved the title of delirious fanatics better than any other denomination.

XXVIII. This contest was by no means confined to *Leipsic*, but diffused its contagion, with incredible celerity, through all the Lutheran churches in the different states and kingdoms of *Europe*. For, from this time, in all the cities, towns, and villages, where Lutheranism was professed, there started up, all of a sudden, persons of various ranks and professions, of both sexes, learned and illiterate, who declared, that they were called, by a *divine impulse*, to pull up iniquity by the root, to restore to its primitive lustre, and propagate through the world, the declining cause of piety and virtue, to govern the church of CHRIST by wiser rules than those by which it was at present directed, and who, partly in their writings, and partly in their private and public discourses, pointed out the means and measures that were necessary to bring about this important revolution. All those, who were struck with this imaginary *impulse*, unanimously agreed, that nothing could have a more powerful tendency to propagate among the multitude solid knowledge, pious feelings, and holy habits than those private meetings, that had been first contrived by SPENER, and that were afterwards introduced into *Leipsic*. Several religious assemblies were accordingly formed in various places, which, though they differed in some circumstances, and were not all conducted and composed with equal wisdom, piety, and prudence, were, however, designed to promote the same general purpose. In the mean time, these unusual, irregular and tumultuous proceedings filled with uneasy and alarming apprehensions both those who were intrusted with the government of the church, and those who sat at the helm of the state. These apprehensions

The progress of these debates.

CENT. XVII

apprehensions were justified by this important consideration, that the pious and well-meaning persons, who composed these assemblies, had indiscreetly admitted into their community a parcel of extravagant and hot-headed fanatics, who foretold the approaching destruction of *Babel* (by which they meant the Lutheran church), terrified the populace with fictitious visions, assumed the authority of prophets honoured with a divine commission, obscured the sublime truths of religion by a gloomy kind of jargon of their own invention, and revived doctrines that had long before been condemned by the church. These enthusiasts also asserted, that the *millennium*, or thousand years reign of the saints on earth, mentioned by St. JOHN, was near at hand. They endeavoured to overturn the wisest establishments and to destroy the best institutions, and desired that the power of preaching and administering public instruction might be given promiscuously to all sorts of persons. Thus was the Lutheran church torn asunder in the most deplorable manner, while the votaries of *Rome* stood by and beheld, with a secret satisfaction, these unhappy divisions. The most violent debates arose in all the Lutheran churches; and persons, whose differences were occasioned rather by mere words, and questions of little consequence, than by any doctrines or institutions of considerable importance, attacked one another with the bitterest animosity; and, in many countries, severe laws were at length enacted against the *Pietists* [m].

The debates carried on with Spener and the divines of Hall.

XXIX. These revivers of piety were of two kinds, who, by their different manner of proceeding, deserve to be placed in two distinct classes. One sect of these practical reformers proposed to carry on their plan without introducing any change into the doctrine, discipline, or form of government that were established in the Lutheran church. The other maintained, on the contrary, that it was impossible to promote the progress of real piety among the Lutherans without making considerable alterations in their doctrine, and changing the whole form of their ecclesiastical discipline and polity. The former had at their head the learned and pious SPENER, who, in the year 1691, removed from *Dresden* to *Berlin*, and whose sentiments were adopted by the professors of the new academy of *Hall*; and particularly by FRANCKIUS and PAULUS ANTONIUS, who had been invited thither from *Leipsic*, where they began to be suspected of *Pietism*. Though few

[m] This whole matter is amply illustrated by the learned Jo. GEORGE WALCHIUS, in his *Introductio ad Controversias*, vol. ii. and iii. who exhibits, successively, the various scenes of this deplorable contest, with a view of the principal points that were controverted, and his judgment concerning each, and a particular account of the writers that displayed their talents on this occasion. It would, indeed, be difficult for any one man to give an ample and exact history of this contest, which was accompanied with so many incidental circumstances, and was, upon the whole, of such a tedious and complicated nature. It were therefore to be wished, that a society of prudent and impartial persons, furnished with a competent knowledge of human nature and political transactions, and also with proper materials, would set themselves to compose the history of *Pietism*. If several persons were employed in collecting from public records, and also from papers that lie yet concealed in the cabinets of the curious, the events which happened in each country where this controversy reigned, and if these materials, thus carefully gathered on the spot, were put in the hands of a man capable of digesting the whole, this would produce a most interesting and useful history.

pretended

pretended to treat either with indignation or contempt the intentions and purpose of these good men (which, indeed, none could despise without affecting to appear the enemy of practical religion and virtue), yet many eminent divines, and more especially the professors and pastors of *Wittemberg*, were of opinion, that, in the execution of this laudable purpose, several maxims were adopted, and certain measures employed, that were prejudicial to the truth, and also detrimental to the interests of the church. Hence they looked on themselves as obliged to proceed publicly, first against SPENER, in the year 1695, and afterwards against his disciples and adherents, as the inventors and promoters of erroneous and dangerous opinions. These debates are of a recent date; so that those, who are desirous of knowing more particularly how far the principles of equity, moderation, and candour influenced the conduct and directed the proceedings of the contending parties, may easily receive a satisfactory information.

XXX. These debates turned upon a variety of points; and therefore the matter of them cannot be comprehended under any one general head. If we consider them indeed in relation to their origin and the circumstances that gave rise to them, we shall then be able to reduce them to some fixed principles. It is well known, that those who had the advancement of piety most zealously at heart, were possessed of a notion, that no order of men contributed more to retard its progress than the clergy, whose peculiar vocation it was to inculcate and promote it. Looking upon this as the root of the evil, it was but natural that their plans of reformation should begin here; and, accordingly, they laid it down as an essential principle, that none should be admitted into the ministry, but such as had received a proper education, were distinguished by their wisdom and sanctity of manners, and had hearts filled with *divine love*. Hence they proposed, in the *first place*, a thorough reformation of the schools of divinity; and they explained clearly enough what they meant by this reformation, which consisted in the following points: That the systematical theology, which reigned in the academies, and was composed of intricate and disputable doctrines and obscure and unusual forms of expression, should be totally abolished;—that polemical divinity, which comprehended the controversies subsisting between Christians of different communions, should be less eagerly studied and less frequently treated, though not entirely neglected;—that all mixture of philosophy and human learning with divine wisdom was to be most carefully avoided;—that, on the contrary, all those, who were designed for the ministry, should be accustomed from their early youth to the perusal and study of the holy Scriptures;—that they should be taught a plain system of theology drawn from these unerring sources of truth;—and that the whole course of their education was to be so directed, as to render them useful in life, by the practical power of their doctrine and the commanding influence of their example. As these maxims were propagated with the greatest industry and zeal, and were explained inadvertently, by some, without those restrictions which prudence seemed to require; these professed patrons and revivers of piety were suspected of designs that could not but render them

The subject of these debates.

obnoxious to censure. They were supposed to despise philosophy and learning, to treat with indifference, and even to renounce, all inquiries into the nature and foundations of religious truth, to disapprove of the zeal and labours of those who defended it against such as either corrupted or opposed it, and to place the whole of *their* theology in certain vague and incoherent declamations concerning the duties of morality. Hence arose those famous disputes concerning the use of philosophy and the value of human learning, considered in connexion with the interests of religion—the dignity and usefulness of *systematic* theology—the necessity of polemic divinity—the excellence of the mystic system—and also concerning the true method of instructing the people.

The *second* great object, that employed the zeal and attention of the persons now under consideration, was, that the candidates for the ministry should not only, for the future, receive such an academical education as would tend rather to solid utility than to mere speculation; but also that they should *dedicate themselves to God* in a peculiar manner, and exhibit the most striking examples of piety and virtue. This maxim, which, when considered in itself, must be acknowledged to be highly laudable, not only gave occasion to several new regulations, designed to restrain the passions of the studious youth, to inspire them with pious sentiments and to excite in them holy resolutions; but also produced another maxim, which was a lasting source of controversy and debate; *viz.* “that no person, that was not himself a model of piety and divine love, was qualified to be a public teacher of piety, or a guide to others in the way of salvation.” This opinion was considered by many as derogatory from the power and efficacy of the word of God, which cannot be deprived of its divine influence by the vices of its ministers; and as a sort of revival of the long-exploded errors of the Donatists: and what rendered it peculiarly liable to an interpretation of this nature was, the imprudence of some Pietists; who inculcated and explained it without those restrictions that were necessary to render it unexceptionable. Hence arose endless and intricate debates, concerning the following questions: “whether the religious knowledge acquired by a wicked man can be termed theology?”—“whether a vitious person can, in effect, attain to a true knowledge of religion?”—“how far the office and ministry of an impious ecclesiastic can be pronounced salutary and efficacious?”—“whether a licentious and ungodly man cannot be susceptible of illumination?”—and other questions of a like nature.

XXXI. These revivers of declining piety went yet further. In order to render the ministry of their pastors as successful as possible, in rousing men from their indolence, and in stemming the torrent of corruption and immorality, they judged two things indispensably necessary. The *first* was, to suppress entirely, in the course of public instruction, and more especially in that delivered from the pulpit, certain maxims and phrases, which the corruption of men leads them frequently to interpret in a manner favourable to the indulgence of their passions. Such, in the judgment of the Pietists, were the following propositions: *No man is able to attain to that perfection*

which

which the divine law requires—good works are not necessary to salvation—in the act of justification, on the part of man, faith alone is concerned, without good works. Many, however, were apprehensive, that, by the suppression of these propositions, truth itself must suffer deeply; and that the Christian religion, deprived thus of its peculiar doctrines, would be exposed, naked and defenceless, to the attacks of its adversaries. The *second* step they took, in order to give efficacy to their plans of reformation, was, to form new rules of life and manners, much more rigorous and austere than those which had been formerly practised; and to place in the class of *sinful* and *unlawful* gratifications several kinds of pleasure and amusement, which had hitherto been looked upon as innocent in themselves, and which could only become *good* or *evil* in consequence of the respective characters of those, who used them with prudence or abused them with intemperance. Thus, dancing, pantomimes, public sports, theatrical diversions, the reading of humorous and comical books, with several other kinds of pleasure and entertainment, were prohibited by the Pietists as unlawful and unseemly; and, therefore, by no means, of an indifferent nature. Many, however, thought this rule of moral discipline, by far, too rigid and severe; and thus was revived the ancient contest of the schoolmen, concerning the famous question, *whether any human actions are truly indifferent*, i. e. equally removed from moral good on the one hand, and from moral evil on the other; and *whether*, on the contrary, it be not true, that *all actions, whatever, must be either considered as good or as evil?* The discussion of this question was attended with a variety of debates upon the several points of the prohibition now mentioned; and these debates were often carried on with animosity and bitterness, and very rarely with that precision, temper, and judgment that the nicety of the matters in dispute required. The *third* thing, on which the *Pietists* insisted, was, that, besides the stated meetings for public worship, private assemblies should be held for prayer and other religious exercises. But many were of opinion, that the cause of true piety and virtue was rather endangered than promoted by these assemblies; and experience and observation seemed to confirm this opinion. It would be both endless and unnecessary to enumerate all the little disputes that arose from the appointment of these private assemblies, and, in general, from the notions entertained and the measures pursued by the *Pietists* [n]. It is, nevertheless, proper to observe, that the lenity and indulgence shewn, by these people, to persons, whose opinions were erroneous and whose errors were, by no means, of an indifferent nature, irritated their adversaries to a very high degree, and made many suspect, that the *Pietists* laid a much greater stress upon practice than upon belief, and, separating what ought ever to be inseparably joined together, held virtuous manners in higher esteem than religious truth. Amidst

[n] These debates were first collected, and also needlessly multiplied, by SCHLEGELIUS, in his *Synopsis Controversiarum sub pietatis prætexta motarum*, which was published, in the year 1701, in 8°.—The reader will also find the arguments, used by the contending parties in this dispute, judiciously summed up in two different works of LANGIUS, the one entitled, *Anti-barbarus*; and the other the *Middle-way*; the former composed in Latin, the latter in German.—See also the TIMOTHEUS VERINUS of VAL. ERN. LOSCHERUS.

CENT. XVII. the prodigious numbers that appeared in these controversies, it was not, at all, surprizing, if the variety of their characters, capacities and views be duly considered, that some were chargeable with imprudence, others with intemperate zeal, and that many, to avoid what they looked upon as unlawful, fell injudiciously into the opposite extreme.

These restorers of vital religion endeavour to promote piety at the expence of truth.

XXXII. The other class of Pietists already mentioned, whose reforming views extended so far as to change the system of doctrine and the form of ecclesiastical government that were established in the Lutheran church, comprehended persons of various characters and different ways of thinking. Some of them were totally destitute of reason and judgment; their errors were the reveries of a disordered brain; and they were rather to be considered as lunatics than as heretics. Others were less extravagant, and tempered the singular notions, they had derived from reading or meditation, with a certain mixture of the important truths and doctrines of religion. We shall mention but a few persons of this class, and those only, who were distinguished from the rest by their superior merit and reputation.

Among these was GODFREY ARNOLD, a native of *Saxony*, a man of extensive reading, tolerable parts, and richly endowed with that natural and unaffected eloquence, which is so wonderfully adapted to touch and to persuade. This man disturbed the tranquillity of the church, towards the conclusion of this century, by a variety of theological productions, that were full of new and singular opinions; and, more especially, by his *ecclesiastical history*, which he had the assurance to impose upon the public, as a work composed with candour and impartiality. His natural complexion was dark, melancholy and austere, and these seeds of fanaticism were so expanded and nourished by the perusal of the *Mystic* writers, that the flame of enthusiasm was kindled in his breast and broke forth in his conduct and writings with peculiar vehemence. He looked upon the *Mystics* as superior to all other writers, nay as the only depositories of the true wisdom; reduced the whole of religion to certain internal *feelings* and *motions*, of which it is difficult to form a just idea; neglected entirely the study of truth; and employed the whole power of his genius and eloquence in enumerating, deploring, and exaggerating the vices and corruptions of human nature. If it is universally allowed to be the first and most essential obligation of an historian to avoid all appearance of partiality, and neither to be influenced by personal attachments nor by private resentment in the recital of facts, it must be fairly acknowledged, that no man could be less fit for writing history than ARNOLD. His whole history, as every one must see who looks into it with the smallest degree of attention, is the production of a violent spirit, and is dictated by a vehement antipathy against the doctrines and institution of the Lutheran church. One of the fundamental principles that influences the judgment and directs the opinions and decisions of this historian, throughout the whole course of his work, is, that all the abuses and corruptions, that have found admittance into the church since the time of the apostles, have been introduced by its ministers and rulers, men of vitious and abandoned characters. From this principle, he draws the following goodly consequence: that all those,

those, who opposed the measures of the clergy, or felt their resentment, were persons of distinguished sanctity and virtue, and that such, on the contrary, as either favoured the ministers of the church or were favoured by them, were strangers to the spirit of true and genuine piety. Hence proceeded ARNOLD's unaccountable partiality in favour of almost all that bore the denomination of *Heretics* [o]; whom he defended with the utmost zeal, without having always understood their doctrine, and, in some cases, without having even examined their arguments. This partiality was highly detrimental to his reputation, and rendered his history peculiarly obnoxious to censure. He did not, however, continue in this way of thinking; but, as he advanced in years and experience, perceived the errors into which he had been led by the impetuosity of his passions and the contagious influence of pernicious examples. This sense of his mistakes corrected the vehemence of his natural temper and the turbulence of his party-spirit, so that, as we learn from witnesses worthy of credit, he became at last a lover of truth and a pattern of moderation [p].

XXXIII. ARNOLD was far surpassed in fanatical malignity and insolence by JOHN CONRAD DIPPELIUS, a Hessian divine, who assumed the denomination of the *Christian Democritus*, inflamed the minds of the simple by a variety of productions, and excited considerable tumults and commotions towards the conclusion of this century. This vain, supercilious, and arrogant doctor, who seemed formed by nature for a satyrast and a buffoon, instead of proposing any new system of religious doctrine and discipline, was solely employed in overturning those that were received in the Protestant church. His days were principally spent in throwing out sarcasms and invectives against all denominations of Christians; and the Lutherans, to whose communion he belonged, were more especially the objects of his raillery and derision, which, on many occasions, spared not those things that had formerly been looked upon as most respectable and sacred. It is much to be doubted, whether he had formed any clear and distinct notions of the doctrines he taught; since, in his views of things, the power of imagination domineered evidently over the dictates of right reason and common sense. But, if he really understood the religious maxims he was propagating, he had not certainly the talent of rendering them clear and perspicuous to others; for nothing can be more ambiguous and obscure than the expressions under which they are conveyed, and the arguments by which they are supported. A man must have the gift of divination, to be able to deduce a regular and consistent system of doctrine from the various productions of this incoherent and unintelligible writer; who was a chemist into the bargain, and whose brain seems to have been heated into a high degree of fermentation by the fire of the laboratory. If the rude, motley, and sarcastical writings of this wrong-headed reformer should reach posterity, it will be certainly a just matter of surprize to our descendants, that a

[o] ARNOLD's History is thus entitled, *Historia Ecclesiastica et Hæretica*. Dr. MOSHEIM's account of this learned man is drawn up with much severity, and perhaps is not entirely destitute of partiality. See the Life of ARNOLD in the *General Dictionary*.]

[p] See COLERI *Vita ARNOLDI*.—*Nouveau Diction. Histor. et Critique*, tom. i. p. 485.
considerable

CENT. XVII. considerable number of their ancestors should have been so blind as to chuse for a model of genuine piety, and a teacher of true religion, a man who had audaciously violated the first and most essential principles of solid piety and sound sense [q].

The inventions
and reveries of
Petersen.

XXXIV. The mild and gentle temper of JOHN WILLIAM PETERSEN, minister and first member of the ecclesiastical consistory of *Lunenbourg*, distinguished him remarkably from the fiery enthusiast now mentioned. But the mildness of this good-natured ecclesiastic was accompanied with a want of resolution, that might be called weakness; and a certain floridness and warmth of imagination, that rendered him peculiarly susceptible of illusion himself and every way proper to lead others innocently into error. Of this he gave a very remarkable specimen in the year 1691, by maintaining publicly that ROSAMOND JULIANA, countess of *Assenburg* (whose disordered brain suggested to her the romantic and chimerical notions) was honoured with a vision of the Deity, and commissioned to make a new declaration of his will to mankind. He also revived and propagated openly the obsolete doctrine of the *Millennium*, which ROSAMOND had confirmed by her pretended authority from above. This first error produced many; for error is fertile, especially in those minds, where imagination has spurned the yoke of reason and considers all its airy visions as solid and important discoveries. Accordingly PETERSEN went about prophesying with his wife [r], who also gave herself out for a kind of oracle, and boasted of her extensive knowledge of the secrets of heaven. They talked of a general *restitution* of all things, at which grand and solemn period all intelligent beings were to be restored to happiness, the gates of hell opened, and wicked men, together with evil spirits, delivered from the guilt, power, and punishment of sin. They supposed that two *distinct* natures, and both of them *human*, were united in CHRIST, one assumed in heaven before the reformation of this globe, the other derived, upon earth, from the Virgin MARY. These opinions were swallowed down by many among the multitude, and were embraced by some of superior rank; they met, however, with great opposition, and were refuted by a considerable number of writers, to whom PETERSEN, who was amply furnished with leisure and eloquence, made voluminous replies. In the year 1692 he was, at length, deposed; and from that period passed his days in the tranquillity of a rural retreat in the territory of *Magdeburg*, where he cheered his solitude by epistolary commerce, and spent the remainder of his days in composition and study [s].

[q] His works were all published, in the year 1747, in five volumes in 4^{to}. and his memory is still highly honoured and respected by many, who consider him as having been, in his day, an eminent teacher of true piety and wisdom. No kind of authors find such zealous readers and patrons as those who deal largely in invective, and swell themselves, by a vain self-sufficiency, into an imagined superiority to the rest of mankind. Besides, DIPPELIUS was an excellent chemist and a good physician, and this procured him many friends and admirers, as all men are fond of riches and long life, and these two sciences were supposed to lead to the one and to the other.

[r] Her name was JOHANNA ELEONORA à MERLAU.

[s] PETERSEN wrote his own Life in German, and it was first published in 8^o. in 1717.— His wife added her Life to it, by way of supplement, in the year 1718. These pieces of biogra-

XXXV. It

XXXV. It is not easy to determine, whether JOHN CASPAR SCHADE and GEORGE BÖSIUS may be associated properly with the persons now mentioned. They were both good men, full of zeal for the happiness and salvation of their brethren; but their zeal was neither directed by prudence nor tempered with moderation. The former, who was minister at *Berlin*, propagated several notions, that seemed crude and uncouth; and, in the year 1697, inveighed, with the greatest bitterness, against the custom that prevails in the Lutheran church of confessing privately to the clergy. These violent remonstrances excited great commotions, and were even attended with popular tumults. BÖSIUS performed the pastoral functions at *Sorau*; and, to awaken sinners from their security, and prevent their treating with negligence and indifference interests, that are most important by being eternal, denied that God would continue always propitious and placable with respect to those offenders, whose incorrigible obstinacy he had foreseen from all eternity; or that he would offer them, beyond a certain period, marked in his decrees, those succours of grace that are necessary to salvation. This tenet, in the judgment of many grave divines, seemed highly injurious to the boundless mercy of God, and was accordingly refuted and condemned in several treatises; it found, nevertheless, an eminent patron and defender in the learned RECHENBERG, professor of divinity at *Leipsic*, not to mention others of less note who appeared in its behalf [1].

CENT. XVII.

Schade and
Bösius.

XXXVI. Among the controversies of inferior note that divided the Lutheran church, we shall first mention those, that broke out between the doctors of *Tubingen* and *Gießen* so early as the year 1616. The principal part of this debate related to the abasement and humiliation, or to, what divines call, the *exinanition* of *Jesus Christ*; and the great point was to know in what this *exinanition* properly consisted, and what was the precise nature and characteristic of this singular situation? That the *Man-Christ* possessed, even in the most dreadful periods of his abasement, the divine properties and attributes he had received in consequence of the *hypostatic union*, was unanimously agreed on by both of the contending parties; but they differed in their sentiments relating to this subtle and intricate question, *Whether Christ, during his mediatorial sufferings and sacerdotal state, really suspended the exertion of these attributes, or only concealed this exertion from the view of mortals?* The latter was maintained by the doctors of *Tubingen*, while those of *Gießen* were inclined to think that the exertion of the divine attributes was really suspended in CHRIST during his humiliation and sufferings. This main question was followed by others, which were much more subtle than important, concerning the manner in which God is present with all his works, the reasons and foundation of this universal presence, the true cause of the omnipresence of CHRIST's body, and others of a like intricate and unintelligible nature. The champions that distinguished themselves on

Contests, concerning the omnipresence of Christ's flesh, between the doctors of *Tubingen* and *Gießen*.

phy will satisfy such as are desirous of a particular account of the character, manners, and talents of this extraordinary pair. For an account of the troubles they excited at *Lunenburg*, see JO. MOLLER *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 639. the *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, A. 1748, p. 974. A. 1749, p. 30—200. & passim.

[1] See WALCHIUS's *Introductio ad Controversias*, p. i. cap. iv.

the

CENT. XVII. the side of the doctors of *Tubingen* were LUCAS OSIANDER, MELCHIOR NICOLAS, and THEODORE THUMMIUS. The most eminent of those that adopted the cause of the divines of *Gieffen* were BALTHAZAR, MENZER, and JUSTUS FEVERBORN. The contest was carried on with zeal, learning, and sagacity; it were to be wished that one could add, that it was managed with wisdom, dignity, and moderation. This, indeed, was far from being the case; but such was the spirit and genius of the age, that many things were now treated with indulgence, or beheld with approbation, which the wisdom and decency of succeeding times have justly endeavoured to discountenance and correct. In order to terminate these disagreeable contests, the Saxon divines were commanded, by their sovereign, to offer themselves as arbitrators between the contending parties in the year 1624; their arbitration was accepted, but it did not, at all, contribute to decide the matters in debate. Their decisions were vague and ambiguous, and were therefore adapted to satisfy none of the parties. They declared, that they could not entirely approve of the doctrine of either, but insinuated, at the same time, that a certain degree of preference was due to the opinions maintained by the doctors of *Gieffen* [u]. Those of *Tubingen* rejected the decision of the Saxon arbitrators; and it is very probable, that the divines of *Gieffen* would have appealed from it also, had not the public calamities, in which *Germany* began to be involved at this time, suspended this miserable contest, by imposing silence upon the disputants, and leaving them in the quiet possession of their respective opinions.

The controversy occasioned by the writings of Rathmannus.

XXXVII. Before the cessation of the controversy now mentioned, a new one was occasioned, in the year 1621, by the writings of HERMAN RATHMAN, minister at *Dantzic*, a man of eminent piety, some learning, and a zealous patron and admirer of ARND's famous book concerning *true Christianity*. This good man was suspected by his colleague CORVINUS, and several others, of entertaining sentiments derogatory from the dignity and power of the sacred writings. These suspicions they derived from a book, he published in the year 1621, *Concerning Christ's Kingdom of Grace*, which, according to the representations of his adversaries, contained the following doctrine; "That the word of God, as it stands in the sacred writings, hath
 "no *innate* power to illuminate the mind, to excite in it a principle of
 "regeneration, and thus to turn it to God; that the *external* word sheweth,
 "indeed, the way to salvation, but cannot *effectually* lead men to it; but
 "that God himself, by the ministry of another and an *internal word*, works
 "such a change in the minds of men, as is necessary to render them agree-
 "able in his sight, and enables them to please him by their words and
 "actions." This doctrine was represented, by CORVINUS and his associates, as the same, which had been formerly held by SCHWENCKFELD, and was professed by the Mystics in general. But whoever will be at the pains to

[u] JO. WOLFG. JAEGER, *Histor. Eccles. et Polit. Sæc. xvii. Decenn. iii.* p. 329.—CHRIST. EBERH. WEIFMANNI *Histor. Ecclesiast. Sæc. xvii.* p. 1178.—WALCHIUS, *loc. cit.* p. 206.—See also CAROLI, ARNOLD, and the other writers, who have written the Ecclesiastical History of these times.

examine with attention the various writings of RATHMAN on this subject, must soon be convinced, that his adversaries either misunderstood his true sentiments, or wilfully misrepresented them. His real doctrine may be comprized in the four following points: “*First*, that the divine word, contained in the holy Scriptures, is endowed with the power of healing the minds of men, and bringing them to God: but that, *secondly*, it cannot exert this power in the minds of corrupt men who resist its divine operation and influence; and that, of consequence, *thirdly*, it is absolutely necessary, that the word be preceded or accompanied by some divine energy, which may prepare the minds of sinners to receive it and remove those impediments that oppose its efficacy; and *fourthly*, that it is by the power of the *holy spirit* or *internal word*, that the external word is rendered capable of exerting its efficacy in enlightening and sanctifying the minds of men [w].” There is, indeed, some difference between these opinions and the doctrine commonly received in the Lutheran church, relating to the efficacy of the divine word; but a careful perusal of the writings of RATHMAN on this subject, and a candid examination of his inaccurate expressions, will persuade the impartial reader, that this difference is neither great nor important; and he will only perceive that this pious man had not the talent of expressing his notions with order, perspicuity, and precision. Be that as it may, this contest grew more general from day to day, and, at length, extended its polemic influence through the whole Lutheran church, the greatest part of whose members followed the example of the Saxon doctors in condemning RATHMAN, while a considerable number, struck with the lustre of his piety and persuaded of the innocence of his doctrine, espoused his cause. In the year 1628, when this controversy was at the greatest height, RATHMAN died, and then the warmth and animosity of the contending parties subsided gradually, and at length ceased.

XXXVIII. It would be repugnant to the true end of history, as well as to all principles of candour and equity, to swell this enumeration of the controversies, that divided the Lutheran church, with the private disputes of certain individuals concerning some particular points of doctrine and worship. Some writers have, indeed, followed this method, not so much with a design to enrich their histories with a multitude of facts and to shew men and opinions in all their various aspects, as with a view to render the Lutherans ridiculous or odious. In the happiest times, and in the best-modelled communities, there will always remain sufficient marks of human imperfection, and abundant sources of private contention, at least, in the imprudence and mistakes of some, and the impatience and severity of others; but it must betray a great want of sound judgment, as well as of candour and impartiality, to form a general estimate of the state and character of a whole church upon such particular instances of imperfection and error. Certain singular opinions and modes of expression were censured by many

Private contro-
versies.

[w] See MOLLERUS's *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. iii. p. 559.—HARTKNOCH's German work, entitled, *Preussische Kirchen-Geschichte*, book iii. ch. viii. p. 812.—ARNOLD's *Kirchen-und Ketzer-Histoire*, p. iii. ch. xvi. p. 115.

CENT. XVII.

in the writings of TARNOVIUS and AFFELMAN, two divines of *Rostock*, who were otherwise men of distinguished merit. This, however, will surprize us less, when we consider, that these doctors often expressed themselves improperly, when their sentiments were just; and that, when their expressions were accurate and proper, they were frequently misunderstood by those who pretended to censure them. JOACHIM LUTKEMAN, a man whose reputation was considerable and, in many respects, well deserved, took it into his head to deny that CHRIST remained *true man* during the three days that intervened between his death and resurrection. This sentiment appeared highly erroneous to many; hence arose a contest, which was merely a dispute about words, resembling many other debates, which, like bubbles, are incessantly swelling and vanishing on the surface of human life. Of this kind, more especially, was the controversy which, for some time, exercised the talents of BÖETIUS and BALDUIN, professors of divinity, the former at *Helmstadt*, and the latter at *Wittenberg*, and had for its subject the following question, *Whether or no the wicked shall one day be restored to life by the merits of Christ?* In the dutchy of *Holstein*, REINBOTH distinguished himself by the singularity of his opinions. After the example of CALIXTUS, he reduced the fundamental doctrines of religion within narrower bounds, than are usually prescribed to them; he also considered the opinion of those Greeks, who deny that the *Holy Ghost* proceeds from the *Son*, as an error of very little consequence. In both these respects, his sentiments were adopted by many; they, however, met with opposition from several quarters, and were censured, with peculiar warmth, by the learned JOHN CONRAD DANHAVER, professor of divinity at *Straßburg*; in consequence of this, a kind of controversy was kindled between these two eminent men, and was carried on with more vehemence than the nature and importance of the matters in debate could well justify [x]. But these and other contests of this nature must not be admitted into that list of controversies, from which we are to form a judgment of the internal state of the Lutheran church during this century.

The debates relating to Prætorius and Arndt.

XXXIX. We cannot say the same thing of certain controversies, which were of a personal rather than a real nature, and related to the orthodoxy or unsoundness of certain men, rather than to the truth or falshood of certain opinions; for these are somewhat more essentially connected with the internal state and history of the church than the contests last mentioned. It is not unusual for those, who professedly embark in the cause of declining piety, and aim, in a solemn, zealous and public manner, at its revival and restoration, to be elated with high and towering views, and warmed with a certain enthusiastic, though noble fervour. This elevation and ardour of mind is, by no means, a source of accuracy and precision; on the contrary, it produces many unguarded expressions, and prevents men of warm piety from forming their language by those rules, which are necessary to render

[x] For an account of all these controversies in general, see ARNOLDI *Histor. Eccles. et Hæret.* p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. vi. p. 957. That, which was occasioned by REINBOTH, is amply and circumstantially related by MOLLERUS, in his *Introductio ad Historiam Chersonesus Cimbrica*, p. ii. p. 190. and in his *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 692.

it clear, accurate, and proper; it frequently dictates expressions and phrases CENT. XVII. that are pompous and emphatic, but, at the same time, allegorical and ambiguous; and leads pious and even sensible men to adopt uncouth and vulgar forms of speech, employed by writers, whose style is as low and barbarous as their intentions are upright and pious, and whose practical treatises on religion and morality have nothing recommendable, but the zeal and fervour with which they are penned. Persons of this warm and enthusiastical turn fall with more facility than any other set of men into the suspicion of heresy, on account of the inaccuracy of their expressions. This many doctors found to be true, by a disagreeable experience, during the course of this century; but it was, in a more particular manner, the fate of STEPHEN PRÆTORIUS, minister of *Solzwedel*, and of JOHN ARNDT, whose piety and virtue have rendered his memory precious to the friends of true religion. PRÆTORIUS had, so early as the preceding century, composed certain treatises, designed to revive a spirit of vital religion, and awaken in the minds of men a zeal for their future and eternal interests. These productions, which were frequently republished during this century, were highly applauded by many, while, in the judgment of others, they abounded with expressions and sentiments, that were partly false and partly adapted by their ambiguity to lead men into error. It cannot be denied, that there are in the writings of PRÆTORIUS some improper and unguarded expressions, that may too easily deceive the ignorant and unwary, as also several marks of that credulity that borders upon weakness; but those, who peruse his works with impartiality, will be fully persuaded of the uprightness of his intentions.

The unfeigned piety and integrity of ARNDT could not secure him from censure. His famous book concerning *true Christianity*, which is still perused with the utmost pleasure and edification by many persons eminent for the sanctity of their lives and manners, met with a warm and obstinate opposition. OSIANDER, ROSTIUS, and other doctors, inveighed against it with excessive bitterness, pretended to find in it various defects, and alledged, among other things, that its style was infected with the jargon of the *Paracelsists*, *Weigelians*, and other *Mystico-chemical* philosophers. It must, indeed, be acknowledged, that this eminent man entertained a high disgust against the philosophy that, in his time, reigned in the schools; nor can it be denied, that he had a high, perhaps an excessive, degree of respect for the chemists, and an ill-placed confidence in their obscure decisions and pompous undertakings. This led him sometimes into conversation with those fantastic philosophers, who, by the power and ministry of *fire*, pretended to unfold both the secrets of nature and the mysteries of religion. But, notwithstanding this, he was declared exempt from any errors of moment by a multitude of grave and pious divines, among whom were EGARD, DILGER, BRELER, GERHARD, and DORSCHÆUS; and in the issue the censures and opposition of his adversaries seemed rather to cast a new lustre on his reputation than to cover him with reproach [y]. We may place in the class, now under

[y] See ARNOLDI *Hist. Eccles. et Hæretica*. p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. vi. p. 940.—WEISMANNI
O O O 2 consideration,

CENT. XVII. consideration, VALENTINE WEIGELIUS, a minister of the church of *Zschopau* in *Misnia*; for though he died in the preceding century, yet it was in this that the greatest part of his writings were published, and also censured as erroneous and of a dangerous tendency. The science of chemistry, which at this time was making such a rapid progress in *Germany*, proved also detrimental to this ecclesiastic; who, though in the main a man of probity and merit, neglected the paths of right reason, and chose rather to wander in the devious wilds of a chimerical philosophy [z].

Jacob Böhmius
or Boehmen.

XL. There were a set of fanatics among the Lutherans who in the flights of their enthusiasm far surpassed those now mentioned, and who had such a high notion of their own abilities as to attempt melting down the present form of religion and casting a new system of piety after a model drawn from their wanton and irregular fancies; it is with some account of the principal of these spiritual projectors that we shall conclude the history of the Lutheran church during this century.

At the head of this visionary tribe we may place JACOB BEHMEN, a taylor at *Gorlitz*, who was remarkable for the multitude of his patrons and adversaries, and whom his admirers commonly called the *German Theosophist*. This man had a natural propensity towards the investigation of mysteries, and was fond of abstruse and intricate inquiries of every kind; and having, partly by books and partly by conversation with certain physicians [a], acquired some knowledge of the doctrine of ROBERT FLUDD and the *Rosicrucians*, which was propagated in *Germany* with great ostentation during this century, he struck out of the element of *fire*, by the succours of imagination, a species of theology much more obscure than the numbers of PYTHAGORAS, or the intricacies of HERACLITUS. Some have bestowed high praises on this enthusiast, on account of his piety, integrity, and sincere love of truth and virtue; and we shall not pretend to contradict these encomiums. But such as carry their admiration of his doctrine so far as to honour him with the character of an *inspired messenger of heaven*, or even of a judicious and wise philosopher, must be themselves deceived and blinded in a very high degree; for never did there reign such obscurity and confusion in the writings of any mortal, as in the miserable productions of JACOB BEHMEN, which exhibit a motley mixture of chemical terms, crude visions, and mystic jargon. Among other dreams of a disturbed and eccentric fancy, he entertained the following chimerical notion: "That the
"divine grace operates by the same rules and follows the same methods,
"that the divine providence observes in the natural world; and that the
"minds of men are purged from their vices and corruptions in the same
"way that metals are purified from their dross;" and this maxim was the principle of his fire-theology. BEHMEN had a considerable number of fol-

Histor. Eccles. Sæc. xvii. p. 1174. 1189.—GODOF. BALTH. SCHARFII Supplementum Historiæ, Litisquæ Arndianæ. Wittemb. 1727, in 8°.

[z] There is an account of WEIGELIUS, more ample than impartial, given by ARNOLD, *loc. cit. lib. xvii. cap. xvii. p. 1088.*

[a] *Viz. TOBIAS KOBER and BALTHAZAR WALTHER.*

lowers,

lowers, in this century, the most eminent of whom were JOHN LEWIS GIFTTHEIL, JOHN ANGELUS WERDENHAGEN, ABRAHAM FRANCKENBERG, THEODORE TZETSCH, PAUL FELGENHAVER, QUIRINUS KUHLMANN, JOHN JACOB ZIMMERMAN; and he has still many votaries and admirers even in our times. There was, indeed, a signal difference between his followers; some of them retained, notwithstanding their attachment to his extravagant system, a certain degree of moderation and good sense; others of them seemed entirely out of their wits, and by their frenzy excited the compassion of those, who were the spectators of their conduct; such were KUHLMAN and GICHTELIUS, the former of whom was burnt at *Moscow* in the year 1684; but, indeed, it may be affirmed in general, that none of the disciples or followers of BEHMEN propagated his doctrine, or conducted themselves in such a manner, as to do honour either to their master or to his cause in judgment of the wise [b].

XLI. Another class of persons, who deserve to be placed immediately after BEHMEN, were they, whom a disordered brain persuaded that they were prophets sent from above, and that they were divinely inspired with the power of foretelling future events. A considerable number of these delirious fanatics arose during the course of this century; and, more especially, at that juncture when the house of *Austria* was employed in maintaining its power, in the empire, against the united armies of *Sweden, France, and Germany*. It is remarkable enough, that the tribe of pretended prophets and diviners is never more numerous than at those critical and striking periods, when great revolutions are expected, or sudden and heavy calamities have happened; as such periods, and the scenes they exhibit, inflame the imagination of the fanatic, and may be turned to the profit of the impostor. The most eminent of the fanatical prophets, now under consideration, were NICHOLAS DRABICIUS, CHRISTOPHER KOTTER, CHRISTINA PONIATOVIA, who found an eloquent defender and patron in JOHN AMOS COMENIO; not to mention JOACHIM GREULICH, ANNE VETTER, MARY FROELICH, GEORGE REICHARD, and several others, who audaciously assumed the same character. It is not necessary to enter into a more circumstantial detail of the history of this visionary tribe, since none of them arose to such a degree of reputation and consequence, as to occasion any considerable tumults by their predictions. It is sufficient to have observed in general, that, even in this century, there were among the Lutherans certain crazy fanatics, who, under the impulse of a disordered imagination, assumed the character and authority of prophets sent from above to enlighten the world [c].

The prophets of
this age.

[b] It is needless to mention the writers who employed their pens in stemming the torrent of BEHMEN's enthusiasm. The works of this fanatic are in every body's hands, and the books that were composed to refute them are well known, and are to be found every where. All that has been alledged in his favour and defence has been carefully collected by ARNOLD, who is, generally speaking, peculiarly eloquent in the praises of those, whom others treat with contempt. For an account of KUHLMAN, and his unhappy fate, see the German work, entitled, *Unschuld. Nachricht*. A. 1748.

[c] ARNOLD is to be commended for giving us an accurate collection of the transactions and

XLII. It

CENT. XVII.

Ezekiel Meth,
Isaiah Stiefel,
Paul Nagel.

XLII. It will not, however, be improper to mention, somewhat more circumstantially, the case of those, who, though they did not arrive at that enormous height of folly, that leads men to pretend to divine inspiration, yet deceived themselves and deluded others by entertaining and propagating the strangest fancies and the most monstrous and impious absurdities. Some time after the commencement of this century, ISAIAH STIEFEL and EZEKIEL METH, inhabitants of *Thuringia*, were observed to throw out the most extraordinary and shocking expressions of speaking of themselves and their religious attainments. These expressions, in the judgment of many, amounted to nothing less than attributing to themselves the divine glory and majesty, and thus implied a blasphemous, or rather a frenetic, insult on the supreme Being and his eternal Son. It is nevertheless scarcely credible, however irrational we may suppose them to have been, that these fanatics should have carried their perverse and absurd fancies to such an amazing height; and it would, perhaps, be more agreeable both to truth and charity to suppose, that they had imitated the pompous and turgid language of the mystic writers in such an extravagant manner, as to give occasion to the heavy accusation abovementioned. Considering the matter even in this candid and charitable light, we may see by their examples how much the constant perusal of the writings of the mystics are adapted to shed darkness, delusion, and folly into the imagination of weak and ignorant men [*d*]. The reveries of PAUL NAGEL, professor of divinity at *Leipfic*, were highly absurd, but of a much less pernicious tendency than these already mentioned. This prophetic dreamer, who had received a light tincture of mathematical knowledge, pretended to see in the position of the stars the events, that were to happen in church and state; and, from a view of these celestial bodies, foretold, in a more particular manner, the erection of a new and most holy kingdom in which CHRIST should reign here upon earth [*e*].

Christian Ho-
burg, Frederic
Breckling, Sei-
denbecher.

XLIII. CHRISTIAN HOBURG, a native of *Lunenbourg*, a man of a turbulent and inconstant spirit, and not more remarkable for his violence than for his duplicity, threw out the most bitter reproaches and invectives against the whole Lutheran church without exception [*f*], and thereby involved himself in various perplexities. He deceived, indeed, the multitude a long time by his dissimulation and hypocrisy; and, by a series of frauds, which

visions of these Enthusiasts, in the third and fourth parts of his *History of Heretics*; since those who are desirous of full information in this matter may easily see, by consulting this historian, that the pretended revelations of these prophets were no more than the phantoms of a disordered imagination. A certain pious, but ignorant man, named BENEDICT BAHNSEN, who was a native of *Holstein*, and lived at *Amsterdam* about the middle of the last century, was so delighted with the writings and predictions of these fanatics, that he collected them carefully and published them. In the year 1670, a catalogue of his library was printed at *Amsterdam*, which was full of chemical and fanatical books.

[*d*] See ARNOLD, *Historia Eccles. et Hæret.* p. iii. cap. iv. p. 32.—THOMASIVS, in his German work, entitled, *Historie de Weisheit und Narrheit*, vol. i. p. iii. p. 150.

[*e*] ARNOLD, *loc. cit.* p. iii. cap. v. p. 53.—ANDR. CAROLI *Memorabilia Ecclesæ*, Sæc. xvii. part. i. lib. iii. cap. iv. p. 513.

[*f*] HOBURG, in some of his petulant and satirical writings, assumed the names of ELIAS PRÆTORIUS and BERNARD BAUMANN.

he undoubtedly looked upon as lawful, he disguised so well his true character that he appeared to many, and especially to persons of a candid and charitable turn, much less contemptible than he was in reality; and though the acrimony and violence of his proceedings were condemned, yet they were supposed to be directed, not against religion itself, but against the licentiousness and vices of its professors, and particularly of its ministers. At length, however, the mask fell from the face of this hypocrite, who became an object of general indignation and contempt, and, deserting the communion of the Lutheran church, went over to the Mennonites [g]. There was a striking resemblance between this petulant railer and FREDERIC BRECKLING; the latter, however, surpassed even the former in impetuosity and malignity. BRECKLING had been pastor first in the dutchy of *Holstein*, and afterwards at *Zwoll*, a city in the United Provinces, where he was deposed from his ministry, and lived a great many years after without being attached to any religious sect or community. There are several of his writings still extant, which, indeed, recommend warmly the practice of piety and virtue, and seem to express the most implacable abhorrence of vitious persons and licentious manners; and yet, at the same time, they demonstrate plainly that their author was destitute of that charity, prudence, meekness, patience, and love of truth, which are the essential and fundamental virtues of a real Christian [h]. It is undoubtedly a just matter of surprize, that these vehement declaimers against the established religion and its ministers, who pretend to be so much more sagacious and sharp-sighted than their brethren, do not perceive a truth, which the most simple may learn from daily observation; even that nothing is more odious and disgusting, than an angry, petulant and violent reformer, who comes to heal the disorders of a community, armed, as it were, with fire and sword, with menaces and terrors. It is also to be wondered, that these men are not aware of another consideration equally obvious, namely, that it is scarcely credible, that a *spiritual* physician will cure another with entire success of the disorders, under which he himself is known to labour.

GEORGE LAURENCE SEIDENBECHER, pastor at *Eisfeld* in *Saxony*, adopted himself, and propagated among the multitude, the doctrine of the MILLENNIUM, or thousand years of CHRIST upon earth; a doctrine which scarcely ever gains admittance but in disordered brains, and rarely produces any other fruits than incoherent dreams and idle visions. SEIDENBECHER was censured on account of this doctrine, and deposed from his pastoral charge [i].

[g] ARNOLD, *loc. cit.* p. iii. cap. xiii. p. 130.—ANDR. CAROLI *loc. cit.* vol. i. p. 1065.—JO. HORNBECK, *Summa Controvers.* p. 535.—MOLLERI *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 337.

[h] ARNOLD has given an account of BRECKLING, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica et Hæret.* part iii. p. 148. and p. iv. p. 1103. he has also published some of his writings (p. 1110.) which sufficiently demonstrate the irregularity and exuberance of his fancy. There is a particular account of this degraded pastor given by MOLLERUS, in his *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. iii. p. 72.

[i] There is a circumstantial account of this man given by ALB. MENO VERPOORTEN, in his *Commentat. de vita et institutis G. L. SEIDENBECHERI*, *Gedani*, 1739, 4^{to}.

CENT. XVII.

Martin Seidel.

XLIV. It would be superfluous to name the other fanatics that deserve a place in the class now before us, since they almost all laboured under the same disorder, and the uniformity of their sentiments and conduct was so perfect, that the history of one, a few instances excepted, may, in a great measure, be considered as the history of them all. We shall therefore conclude this crazy list with a short account of the very worst of the whole tribe, MARTIN SEIDELIUS, a native of *Silesia*, who endeavoured to form a sect in *Poland* towards the conclusion of the preceding century and the commencement of this, but could not find followers, even among the Socinians; so wild were his views, and so extravagant his notions. This audacious adventurer in religious novelties was of opinion, that God had, indeed, promised a Saviour or MESSIAH to the Jews; but that *this* MESSIAH had never appeared, and never would appear, on account of the sins of the Jewish people, which rendered them unworthy of this great deliverer. From hence he concluded, that it was erroneous to look upon CHRIST as the MESSIAH; that the only office of JESUS was, to interpret and republish the law of nature, that had been perverted and obscured by the vices, corruptions, and ignorance of men; and that the whole duty of man, and all the obligations of religion, were fulfilled by an obedience to this law, republished and explained by JESUS CHRIST. To render this doctrine more defensible and specious, or, at least, to get rid of a multitude of arguments and express declarations that might be drawn from the holy Scriptures to prove its absurdity, he boldly rejected all the books of the New Testament. The small number of disciples, that adopted the fancies of this intrepid innovator, were denominated *semi-judaizers* [k]. Had he appeared in our times, he would have given less offence, than at the period in which he lived; for, if we except his singular notion concerning the MESSIAH, his doctrine was such as would at present be highly agreeable to many persons in *Great-Britain, Holland, and other countries* [l].

C H A P. II.

The HISTORY of the REFORMED CHURCH.

The limits of the
Reformed church
extended,

I. IT has been already observed, that the Reformed church, considered in the most comprehensive sense of that term, as forming a *whole*, composed of a great variety of parts, is rather united by the principles of moderation and fraternal charity, than by a perfect uniformity in doctrine, discipline, and worship. It will, therefore, be proper to take, first, a view of

[k] See GUSTAVI GEORGII ZELTNERI *Historia Crypto-Socinismi Altorffini*, vol. i. p. 268. 335.

[(l) We are much at a loss to know what Dr. MOSHEIM means by this insinuation, as also the persons he has in view; for, on the one hand, it is sufficiently evident, that he cannot mean the *Deists*; and, on the other, we know of no denomination of Christians, who *boldly reject all the Books of the New Testament*. This insinuation seems to have been thrown out in a fit of ill humour.]

those

those events, that related to this great body collectively considered; and afterwards to enter into a detail of the most memorable occurrences that happened in the particular communities of which it is composed. The principal accessions it received during this century have already been mentioned, when, in the history of the Lutheran church, we related the changes and commotions that happened in the principalities of *Hessia* and *Brandenburg* [m]. These, however, were not the only changes, that took place in favour of the Reformed church. Its doctrine was embraced, about the commencement of this century, by ADOLPHUS, duke of *Holstein*, and it was naturally expected, that the subjects would follow the example of their prince; but this expectation was disappointed, by the death of ADOLPHUS, in the year 1616 [n]. HENRY, duke of *Saxony*, withdrew also from the communion of the Lutherans, in whose religious principles he had been educated; and, in the year 1688, embraced the doctrine of the Reformed church at *Deffau*, in consequence, as some alledge, of the solicitations of his dutchess [o]. In *Denmark*, about the beginning of this century, there were still a considerable number of persons, who secretly espoused the sentiments of that church, and more especially could never reconcile themselves to the Lutheran doctrine of CHRIST'S *bodily presence with the sacrament of the eucharist*. They were confirmed in their attachment to the tenets of the Reformed, by HEMMINGIUS and other followers of MELANCTHON, whose secret ministry and public writings were attended with considerable success. The face of things, however, changed; and the Reformed in *Denmark* saw their expectations vanish, and their credit sink, in the year 1614, when CANUT bishop of *Gottenburg*, who had given too plain intimations of his propensity to the doctrines of CALVIN, was deprived of his episcopal dignity [p]. The progress of the Reformed religion in *Africa*, *Asia*, and *America*, is abundantly known; it was carried into these distant regions by the English and Dutch emigrants, who formed settlements there for the purposes of commerce, and founded flourishing churches in the various provinces where they fixed their habitations. It is also known, that in several places where Lutheranism was established, the French, German, and British members of the Reformed church were allowed the free exercise of their religion.

[m] See section ii. part ii. chap. i. § i, ii. where the *History of the Lutheran Church* commences with an account of the loss that church sustained by the secession of MAURICE, landgrave of *Hesse-Cassel*, and JOHN SIGISMUND, elector of *Brandenburg*, who embraced solemnly the doctrine of the Reformed church, the former in 1604, and the latter in 1614.]

[n] JO. MOLLER *Introd. ad Histor. Chersonesi Cimbricae*, p. ii. p. 101.—ERIC. PON TOPPIDANI *Annales Ecclesiae Danicae Diplomatici*, tom. iii. p. 691.

[o] See MOEBII *Selectæ Dissp. Theolog.* p. 1137.—The duke of *Saxony* published to the world a *Confession of his Faith*, containing the reasons of his change. This piece, which the divines of *Leipsick* were obliged by a public order to refute, was defended against their attacks by the learned ISAAC DE BEAUSOBRE, at that time pastor at *Magdeburg*, in a book, entitled, *Defense de la Doctrine des Reformées, et en particulier de la Confession de S. A. S. Mgr. le Duc HENRY DE SAXE contre un Livre composé par la Faculté de Theologie à Leipsic*. *Magdeb.* 1694, in 8^{vo}.

[p] PONTOPPIDAN, *Annal. Eccles. Danicae*, tom. iii. p. 695.

CENT. XVII.

The decline of
the Reformed
church in France.

II. Of all the calamities, that tended to diminish the influence and eclipse the lustre of the Reformed church, none was more dismal in its circumstances, and more unhappy in its effects, than the deplorable fate of that church in *France*. From the time of the accession of HENRY IV, to the throne of that kingdom, the Reformed church had acquired the form of a body-politic [q]. Its members were endowed with considerable privileges; they were also secured against insults of every kind by a solemn edict, and were possessed of several fortified places, particularly, the strong city of *Rochele*; in which, to render their security still more compleat, they were allowed to have their own garrisons. This body-politic was not, indeed, always under the influence and direction of leaders eminent for their prudence, or distinguished by their permanent attachment to the interests of the crown, and the person of the sovereign. Truth and candour oblige us to acknowledge, that the *Reformed* conducted themselves, on some occasions, in a manner inconsistent with the demands of a regular subordination. Sometimes, amidst the broils and tumults of faction, they joined the parties that opposed the government; at others, they took important steps without the king's approbation or consent; nay, they went so far as to solicit, more than once, without so much as disguising their measures, the alliance and friendship of *England* and *Holland*, and formed views which, at least in appearance, were scarcely consistent with the tranquillity of the kingdom, nor with a proper respect for the authority of its monarch. Hence the contests and civil broils that arose in the year 1621, and subsisted long, between LEWIS XIII and his protestant subjects; and hence the severe and despotic maxim of RICHLIEU, the first minister of that monarch, that the kingdom of *France* could never enjoy the sweets of peace, nor the satisfaction that is founded upon the assurance of public safety, before the Protestants were deprived of their towns and strong-holds, their rights and privileges, and their ecclesiastical polity were crushed to pieces and totally suppressed. This haughty minister, after many violent efforts and hard struggles, obtained, at length, his purpose. For in the year 1628, the town of *Rochele*, the chief bulwark of the Reformed interest in *France*, was taken, after a long and difficult siege, and annexed to the crown. From this fatal event the Reformed party in *France*, defenceless and naked, dates its decline; since, after the reduction of their chief city, they had no other resource than the pure clemency and generosity of their sovereign [r]. Those, who judge of the reduction of this place by the maxims of civil policy, considered the conduct of the French court as entirely consistent with the principles both of wisdom and justice; since nothing can be more detrimental to the tranquillity and safety of the nation, than a body-politic erected in its bosom, independent on the supreme authority of the state, and secured against its

[q] *Imperium in imperio*, i. e. an empire within an empire.[r] See LE CLERC, *Vie de Cardinal RICHLIEU*, tom. i. p. 69. 77. 177. 199. 269.—LE VASSOR, *Histoire de LOUIS XIII*, tom. iii. p. 676. tom. iv. p. i. and the following volumes. See also the *Memoirs* of SULLY (the friend and confidant of HENRY IV, who, though a Protestant, acknowledges frankly the errors of his party), vol. iii, iv, v.

influence or inspection by an external force. And had the French monarch, satisfied with depriving the Protestants of their strong-holds, continued to maintain them in the possession of that liberty of conscience and that free exercise of their religion, for which they had shed so much blood, and to the enjoyment of which their eminent services to the house of *Bourbon* had given them such a fair and illustrious title, it is highly probable, they would have born with patience this infraction of their privileges and the loss of that liberty, that had been confirmed to them by the most solemn edicts.

III. But the court of *France*, and the despotic views of its minister, were not satisfied with this success. Having destroyed that form of civil polity that had been annexed to the Reformed church, as a security for the maintenance of its religious privileges, and was afterwards considered as detrimental to the supreme authority of the state, they proceeded still further; and, regardless of the royal faith confirmed by the most solemn declarations, perfidiously invaded those privileges of the church that were merely of a spiritual and religious nature. At first, the court, and the ministers of its tyranny, put in practice all the arts of insinuation and persuasion, in order to gain over the heads of the Reformed church and the more learned and celebrated ministers of that communion. Pathetic exhortations, alluring promises, artful interpretations of those doctrines of popery, that were most disagreeable to the protestants; in a word, every insidious method was employed, to conquer their aversion to the church of *Rome*. *RICHLIEU* exhausted all the resources of his dexterity and artifice, and put into execution, with the most industrious assiduity, all the means that he thought the most adapted to seduce the Protestants into the Romish communion. When all these stratagems were observed to produce little or no effect, barbarity and violence were employed to extirpate and destroy a set of men, whom mean perfidy could not seduce, and whom weak arguments were insufficient to convince. The most inhuman laws, that the blind rage of bigotry could dictate, the most oppressive measures, that the ingenious efforts of malice could invent, were put in execution to damp the courage of a party, that were become odious by their resolute adherence to the dictates of their consciences, and to bring them by force under the yoke of *Rome*. The French bishops distinguished themselves by their intemperate and unchristian zeal in this horrid scene of persecution and cruelty. Many of the Protestants sunk under the weight of despotic oppression, and yielded up their faith to armed legions, that were sent to convert them; several fled from the storm, and deserted their families, their friends, and their country; and by far the greatest part persevered, with a noble and heroic constancy, in the purity of that religion, which their ancestors had delivered and happily separated from the manifold superstitions of a corrupt and idolatrous church.

The injurious and tyrannical treatment it receives from the French court.

IV. When at length every method which artifice or perfidy could invent had been practised in vain against the Protestants under the reign of *LEWIS XIV*, the bishops and Jesuits, whose counsels had a peculiar influence in the cabinet of that prince, judged it necessary to extirpate by fire and sword this resolute people; and thus to ruin, as it were by one

The edict of *Nantes* revoked.

CENT. XVII. mortal blow, the cause of the reformation in *France*. Their insidious arguments and importunate solicitations had such an effect upon the weak and credulous mind of LEWIS, that, in the year 1685, trampling on the most solemn obligations, and regardless of all law human and divine, he revoked the *Edict of Nantes*; and thereby deprived the Protestants of the liberty of serving God according to their consciences. This revocation was accompanied, indeed, with the applause of *Rome*; but it excited the indignation even of many Roman catholics, whose bigotry had not effaced or suspended, on this occasion, their natural sentiments of generosity and justice. It was, moreover, followed by a measure still more tyrannical and shocking, even an express order, addressed to all the Reformed churches to embrace the Romish faith. The consequences of this cruel and unrighteous proceeding were highly detrimental to the true interests and the real prosperity of the French nation [s], by the prodigious emigrations it occasioned among the Protestants, who sought, in various parts of *Europe*, that religious liberty and that human treatment which their mother-country had so cruelly refused them. Those among them, whom the vigilance of their enemies guarded so closely as to prevent their flight, were exposed to the brutal rage of an unrelenting soldiery, and were assailed by every barbarous form of persecution, that could be adapted to subdue their courage, exhaust their patience; and thus engage them to a feigned and external profession of popery, which in their consciences they beheld with the utmost aversion and disgust. This crying act of perfidy and injustice in a prince, who, on other occasions, gave evident proofs of his generosity and equity, is sufficient to shew, in their true and genuine colours, the spirit of the Romish church and of the Roman pontifs, and the manner in which they stand affected to those, whom they consider as *Heretics*. It is peculiarly adapted to convince the impartial and attentive observer, that the most solemn oaths and the most sacred treaties are never looked upon, by this church and its pontifs, as respectable and obligatory, when the violation of them may contribute to advance their interests, or to accomplish their views.

The sufferings of
the Waldenses
and Protestants
of the Palatinate.

V. The *Waldenses*, who lived in the vallies of *Piedmont*, and had embraced the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the church of *Geneva*, were oppressed and persecuted, in the most barbarous and inhuman manner, during the greatest part of this century, by the ministers of *Rome*; this persecution was carried on with peculiar marks of rage and enormity in the years 1655, 1686, and 1696, and seemed to portend nothing less than the

[s] See the *Life of ISAAC DE BEAUSOBRE* (composed by the ingenious ARMAND DE LA CHAPELLE in French, and subjoined to BEAUSOBRE's *Remarques Historiques, Critiques, et Philologiques sur le Nouveau Testament*) p. 259.

[Some late hireling writers, employed by the Jesuits, have been audacious enough to plead the cause of the *Revocation* of the edict of *Nantes*. But it must be observed, to the honour of the French nation, that these impotent attempts, to justify the measures of a persecuting and unrelenting priesthood, have been treated almost universally at *Paris* with indignation and contempt. They, who are desirous of seeing a true state of the losses the French nation sustained, by the revocation of the famous edict now mentioned, have only to consult the curious and authentic account

total

total destruction and entire extinction of that unhappy nation [1]. The most horrid scenes of violence and bloodshed were exhibited on this theatre of papal tyranny; and the small numbers of the Waldenses that survived them, are indebted for their existence and support, precarious and uncertain as it is, to the continual intercession made for them by the English and Dutch governments, and also by the Swiss cantons, who never cease to solicit the clemency of the duke of Savoy in their behalf.

The church of the *Palatinate*, which had been long at the head of the Reformed churches in *Germany*, declined apace from the year 1685, when a Roman-catholic prince was raised to that electorate. This decline became, at length, so great, that, instead of being the first, it was the least considerable of all the Protestant assemblies in that country.

VI. The eminent and illustrious figure that the principal members of the Reformed church made in the learned world is too well known, and the reputation they acquired by a successful application to the various branches of literature and science is too well established, to require our entering into a circumstantial detail of that matter. We shall also pass in silence the names of those celebrated men, who have acquired immortal fame by their writings, and transmitted their eminent usefulness to succeeding times in their learned and pious productions. Out of the large list of these famous authors that adorned the Reformed church, it would be difficult to select the most eminent; and this is a sufficient reason for our silence [u]. The supreme guide and legislator of those that applied themselves to the study of philosophy had been ARISTOTLE, who, for a long time, reigned unri-

The state of letters and philosophy in the Reformed church.

of the state of that nation, taken from memorials drawn up by the intendants of the several provinces for the use of the duke of Burgundy, and published, in the year 1727, in two volumes in folio, under the following title: *Etat de la France, extrait par M. le Comte de BOULAINVILLIERS des Memoires dresés par les Intendans du Royaume, par l'Ordre du Roi LOUIS XIV, à la Sollicitation du Duc de Bourgogne.* See also VOLTAIRE, *Sur la Tolerance*, p. 41 and 201. And, for an account of the conduct of the French court towards the Protestants at that dismal period, see the incomparable memorial of the learned and pious CLAUDE, entitled, *Plaintes des Protestans de France*, p. 12—85. edit. of *Cologne*.]

[1] LEGER, *Histoire Generale des Eglises Vaudoises*, p. ii. c. vi. p. 72.—GILLES, *Histoire Ecclesiast. des Eglises Vaudoises*, ch. xlix. p. 353.—There is a particular history of the persecution suffered by these victims of papal cruelty, in the year 1686, which was published in 8^{vo} at Rotterdam, in the year 1688.

[(u) The list of the eminent divines and men of learning, that were ornaments to the Reformed church in the seventeenth century, is indeed extremely ample. Among those, that adorned Great-Britain, we shall always remember with peculiar veneration the immortal names of Newton, Barrow, Cudworth, Boyle, Chillingworth, Usher, Bedell, Hall, Pocock, Fell, Lightfoot, Hammond, Calamy, Walton, Baxter, Pearson, Stillingfleet, Mede, Parker, Oughtred, Burnet, Tillotson, and many others well known in the literary world. In Germany we find Pareus, Scultet, Fabricius Alting, Pelargus, and Bergius. In Switzerland and Geneva, Hospinian, the two Buxtorfs, Hottinger, Heidegger, and Turretin. In the churches and academies of Holland, we meet with the following learned divines: Drusus, Amama, Gomar, Rivet, Cloppenburg, Vossius, Cocceius, Voetius, Des Marets, Heidan, Momma, Burman, Wittichius, Hoornbeek, the Spanheims, Le Moyne, De Mastricht, and others. Among the French doctors, we may reckon Cameron, Chamier, Du Moulin, Mestrezat, Blondel, Drelincourt, Daillé, Amyraut, the two Capps, De la Place, Gamstole, Croy, Morus, Le Blanc, Pajon, Bochart, Claude, Alix, Jurieu, Basnage, Abbadie, Beausobre, Lenfant, Martin, Des Vignoles, &c.]

valled

CENT. XVII.

valled in the Reformed, as well as in the Lutheran schools; and was exhibited, in both, not in his natural and genuine aspect, but in the motley and uncouth form in which he had been dressed up by the scholastic doctors. But when GASSENDI and DES CARTES appeared, the Stagirite began to decline, and his fame and authority diminished gradually from day to day. Among the French and Dutch, many adopted the Cartesian philosophy at its first dawn; and a considerable number of the English embraced the principles of GASSENDI, and were singularly pleased with his prudent and candid manner of investigating truth. The Aristotelians every where, and more especially in *Holland*, were greatly alarmed at this revolution in the philosophical world, and set themselves, with all their vigour, to oppose its progress. They endeavoured to persuade the people, that the cause of truth and religion must suffer considerably by the efforts that were made to dethrone ARISTOTLE, and bring into disrepute the doctrine of his interpreters; but the principal cause of their anxiety and zeal, was the apprehension of losing their places in the public schools; a thought which they could not bear with any degree of patience [w]. However, the powerful lustre of truth, which unfolded daily more and more its engaging charms, and the love of liberty, which had been held in chains by peripatetic tyranny, obliged this obstinate sect to yield, and reduced them to silence; and hence it is, that the doctors of the Reformed church carry on, at this day, their philosophical inquiries with the same freedom that is observable among the Lutherans. It may, indeed, be a question with some, whether ARISTOTLE be not, even yet, secretly revered in some of the English universities. It is at least certain, that, although under the government of CHARLES II, and the two succeeding reigns, the mathematical philosophy had made a most extensive progress in *Great-Britain*, there were, nevertheless, both at *Oxford* and *Cambridge*, some doctors, who preferred the ancient system of the schools before the new discoveries now under consideration.

Interpreters and
expositors of
Scripture.

VII. All the interpreters and expositors of Scripture, that made a figure in the Reformed church, about the commencement of this century, followed scrupulously the method of CALVIN in their illustrations of the sacred writings, and unfolded the true and natural signification of the words of Scripture, without perplexing their brains to find out deep mysteries in plain expressions, or to force, by the inventive efforts of fancy, a variety of singular notions from the metaphorical language, that is frequently used by the inspired writers. This universal attachment to the method of CALVIN, was, indeed, considerably diminished, in process of time, by the credit and influence of two celebrated commentators, who struck out new paths in the sphere of sacred criticism. These were HUGO GROTIUS and JOHN COCCEIUS. The former departed less from the manner of interpretation, generally received, than the latter. Like CALVIN, he followed, in his commentaries both on the Old and New Testament, the literal and obvious

[w] See BAILLET, *Vie de DES CARTES*, passim.

signification of the words employed by the sacred writers; but he differed considerably from that great man in his manner of explaining the predictions of the prophets. The hypothesis of GROTIUS, relating to that important subject, amounts to this: "That the predictions of the ancient prophets were all accomplished, in the events to which they directly pointed, before the coming of CHRIST; and that therefore the natural and obvious sense of the words and phrases, in which they were delivered, does not terminate in our blessed Lord; but that in certain of these predictions, and more especially in those which the writers of the New Testament apply to CHRIST, there is, besides the literal and obvious signification, a hidden and mysterious sense, that lies concealed under the external mask of certain *persons*, certain *events*, and certain *actions*, which are *representative* of the person, ministry, sufferings, and merits of the son of God."

The method of COCCEIUS was entirely different from this. He looked upon the whole history of the Old Testament as a perpetual and uninterrupted representation or mirror of the history of the divine Saviour, and of the Christian church; he maintained, moreover, that all the prophecies have a literal and direct relation to CHRIST; and he finished his romantic system, by laying it down as a certain maxim, that all the events and revolutions that shall happen in the church, until the end of time, are prefigured and pointed out, though not all with the same degree of evidence and perspicuity, in different places of the Old Testament [x]. These two eminent commentators, had each his zealous disciples and followers. The Arminians in general, many of the English and French divines, together with those warm votaries of ancient Calvinism, who are called *Voetians* (from their chief GISEBERT VOET, the great adversary of COCCEIUS), all adopted the method of interpreting Scripture introduced by GROTIUS. On the other hand, many of the Dutch, Swiss, and Germans were singularly delighted with the learned fancies of COCCEIUS. There are, however, still greater numbers of prudent and impartial divines, who, considering the extremes into which these two eminent critics have run, and disposed to profit by what is really solid in both their systems, neither reject nor embrace their opinions in the lump, but agree with them both in some things, and differ from them both in others. It is further to be observed, that neither the followers of GROTIUS nor of COCCEIUS are agreed among themselves, and that these two general classes of expositors may be divided into many subordinate ones. A considerable number of English divines of the *Episcopal* church refused to adopt the opinions, or to respect the authority, of these modern expositors; appealed to the decisions of the primitive fathers; and maintained, that the sacred writings ought always to be understood in

[x] It is become almost a proverbial saying, that *in the Books of the Old Testament COCCEIUS finds CHRIST every where, while GROTIUS meets him no where.* The first part of this saying is certainly true; the latter much less so. For it appears, with sufficient evidence, from the *Commentaries* of GROTIUS, that he finds CHRIST prefigured in many places of the Old Testament, not, indeed, *directly* in the *letter* of the prophecies, where COCCEIUS discovers him, but *mysteriously*, under the appearance of certain persons, and in the *secret* sense of certain transactions.

that

CENT. XVII. that sense *only*, which has been attributed to them by these ancient doctors of the rising church [y].

State of Didactic theology in the Reformed church.

VIII. The doctrines of Christianity, which had been so sadly disfigured among the Lutherans by the obscure jargon and the intricate tenets of the scholastic philosophy, met with the same fate in the Reformed churches. The first successful effort, that prevented these churches from falling entirely under the *Aristotelian* yoke, was made by the *Arminians*, who were remarkable for expounding with simplicity and perspicuity the truths and precepts of religion, and who censured, with great plainness and severity, those ostentatious doctors who affected to render them obscure and unintelligible by expressing them in the *terms*, and reducing them under the *classes* and divisions, used in the schools. The *Cartesians* and *Cocceians* contributed also to deliver theology from the chains of the Peripatetics; though it must be allowed that it had not, in some respects, a much better fate in the hands of these its deliverers. The *Cartesians* applied the principles and tenets of their philosophy in illustrating the doctrines of the Gospel; the *Cocceians* imagined, that they could not give a more sublime and engaging aspect to the Christian religion, than by representing it under the notion of a *covenant* entered into between God and man [z]; and both these manners of proceeding were disliked by the wisest and most respectable divines

[(y) These have been confuted by the learned doctor WHITBY, in his important work, *Concerning the Interpretation of Scripture after the manner of the Fathers*, which was published at London in 8^{vo} in the year 1714, under the following title: *Dissertatio de Scripturarum Interpretatione secundum Patrum Commentarios, &c.*—In this dissertation, which was the fore-runner of the many remarkable attempts that were afterwards made to deliver the right of private judgment, in matters of religion, from the restraints of human authority, the judicious author has shewn, *first*, that the holy Scripture is the only rule of faith, and that by it alone we are to judge of the doctrines that are necessary to salvation; *secondly*, that the fathers, both of the primitive times and also of succeeding ages, are extremely deficient and unsuccessful in their explications of the sacred writings; and, *thirdly*, that it is impossible to terminate the debates, that have been raised concerning the Holy Trinity, by the opinions of the fathers, the decisions of councils, or by any tradition that is really universal. The contradictions, absurdities, the romantic conceits and extravagant fancies, that are to be found in the commentaries of the fathers, were never collected into such a ridiculous point of view as they are in this performance. The worst part of the matter is, that such a production as doctor WHITBY's, in which all the mistakes of these ancient expositors, are culled out and compiled with such care, is too much adapted to prejudice young students even against what may be good in their writings, and thus disgust them against a kind of study, which, when conducted with impartiality and prudence, has its uses. It is the infirmity of our nature to be fond of extremes.]

[(z) It is somewhat surprizing, that Dr. MOSHEIM should mention this circumstance as an invention of COCCEIUS, or as a manner of speaking peculiar to him. The representation of the Gospel-dispensation under the idea of a *Covenant*, whether this representation be literal or metaphorical, is to be found, almost every where, in the *Epistles of St. PAUL*, and the other Apostles, though very rarely (scarcely more than twice) in the Gospels. This phraseology has also been adopted by Christians of almost all denominations. It is, indeed, a manner of speaking that has been grossly abused by those divines, who, urging the metaphor too closely, exhibit the sublime transactions of the divine wisdom under the narrow and imperfect forms of human tribunals; and thus lead to false notions of the springs of action, as well as of the dispensations and attributes of the supreme Being. We have remarkable instances of this abuse, in a book lately translated into English, I mean, the *Oeconomy of the Covenants*, by WITSIUS, in which that learned and pious man, who has deservedly gained an eminent reputation by other valuable productions, has incon-

of

of the Reformed church. They complained with reason, that the tenets and distinctions of the Cartesian philosophy had as evident a tendency to render the doctrines of Christianity obscure and intricate, as the abstruse terms and the endless divisions and subdivisions of the Peripatetics. They observed also that the metaphor of a *covenant*, applied to the Christian religion, must be attended with many inconveniencies, by leading uninstructed minds to form a variety of ill-grounded notions, which is the ordinary consequence of straining metaphors; and that it must contribute to introduce into the colleges of divinity, the captious terms, distinctions, and quibbles that are employed in the ordinary courts of justice; and thus give rise to the most trifling and ill-judged discussions and debates about religious matters. Accordingly, the greatest part both of the British and French doctors, refusing to admit the intricacies of *Cartesianism* and the imagery of Cocceius into their theological system, followed the free, easy, and unaffected method of the Arminian divines, in illustrating the truths and enforcing the duties of Christianity.

IX. We have had formerly occasion to observe, that doctor WILLIAM AMES, a Scots divine, was one of the first, among the Reformed, who attempted to treat morality as a separate science, to consider it abstractedly from its connexion with any particular system of doctrine, and to introduce new light and a new degree of accuracy and precision into this *master-science* of life and manners. The attempt was laudable, had it been well executed; but the system of this learned writer was dry, theoretical, and subtle, and was, thus, much more adapted to the instruction of the studious, than to the practical direction of the Christian. The Arminians, who are known to be much more zealous in enforcing the duties of Christianity, than in illustrating its truths, and who generally employ more pains in directing the will than in enlightening the understanding, engaged several authors of note to exhibit the precepts and obligations of morality in a more useful, practical, and popular manner; but the English and French surpassed all the moral writers of the Reformed church in penetration, solidity, and in the ease, freedom, and perspicuity of their method and compositions. MOSES AMYRAUT, a man of a sound understanding and subtle genius, was the first of the French divines, who distinguished themselves in this kind of writing. He composed an accurate and elaborate system of morality, in a style, indeed, that is now become obsolete; and those more moderate French writers, such as LA PLACETTE and PIETET, who acquired such a high and eminent reputation on account of their moral writings, owe to the excellent work now mentioned a considerable part of their glory. While *England* groaned under the horrors and tumults of a civil war, it was chiefly the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* that employed their talents and their pens in promoting the cause of practical religion. During this unhappy period, indeed, these doctors were remarkable for the austere gravity of their manners, and for a melancholy complexion and turn of mind; and these ap-
[considerately introduced the captious, formal, and trivial terms, employed in human courts, into his descriptions of the stupendous scheme of redemption.]

The state of
practical religion
and morality.

CENT. XVII.

peared abundantly in their compositions. Some of them were penned with such rigour and severity, as discovered either a total ignorance of the present imperfect state of humanity, or an entire want of all sort of indulgence for its unavoidable infirmities. Others were composed with a spirit of enthusiasm, that betrayed an evident propensity to the doctrine of the Mystics. But when HOBBS appeared, the scene changed. A new set of illustrious and excellent writers arose to defend the truths of religion and the obligations of morality against this author, who aimed at the destruction of both, since he subjected the unchangeable nature of religion to the arbitrary will of the sovereign, and endeavoured to efface the eternal distinction that there is between moral good and evil. CUDWORTH, CUMBERLAND, SHARROCK, and others [a], alarmed at the view of a system so false in its principles, and so pernicious in its effects, rendered eminent service to the cause of religion and morals by their immortal labours, in which, arising to the *first principles of things*, and opening the primitive and eternal fountains of *truth* and *good*, they illustrated clearly the doctrines of the *one* with the fairest evidence, and established the obligations of the *other* on the firmest foundations.

The controversies concerning Predestination and Grace.

X. About the commencement of this century, the academy of Geneva was in such high repute among the Reformed churches, that it was resorted to from all quarters by such as were desirous of a learned education; and more especially by those students of theology, whose circumstances in life permitted them to frequent this famous seminary [b]. Hence it very naturally happened, that the opinions of CALVIN, concerning the *Decrees of God* and *Divine Grace*, became daily more universal, and were gradually introduced every where into the schools of learning. There was not, however, any public law or confession of faith that obliged the pastors of the Reformed churches, in any part of the world, to conform their sentiments to the theological doctrines that were adopted and taught at Geneva [c]. And accordingly there were many, who either rejected entirely the doctrine of that academy on these intricate points, or received it with certain restrictions and modifications. Nay, even those, who were in general attached to the theological system of Geneva, were not perfectly agreed about the manner of explaining the doctrine relating to the divine decrees. The greatest part were of opinion, that God had only *permitted* the first man to fall into transgression, without positively *predetermining* his fall. But others went much further, and, presumptuously forgetting their own ignorance on the one hand, and the wisdom and equity of the divine counsels on the other, maintained, that God, in order to exercise and display his awful *justice* and his free *mercy*, had decreed from all eternity the transgression of ADAM; and so ordered the course of events, that our first parents could not possibly

[(a) See LELAND's *View of the Deistical Writers*, vol. i. p. 48.]

[b] The lustre and authority of the academy of Geneva began gradually to decline from the time, that the United Provinces being formed into a free and independent republic, universities were founded at Leyden, Franeker, and Utrecht.

[c] See, for a full demonstration of this assertion, GROTIUS's *Apologeticus*, &c. as also several treatises, written in Dutch, by THEOD. VOLKH. COORNKERT, of whom ARNOLDT makes particular mention in his *Historia Eccles. et Hæret.* tom. ii.

avoid their unhappy fall. Those that held this latter sentiment were denominated *Supralapsarians*, to distinguish them from the *Sublapsarian* doctors, who maintained the doctrine of *permission* already mentioned. CENT. XVII.

XI. It is remarkable enough, that the *Supralapsarian* and *Sublapsarian* divines forgot their debates and differences, as matters of little consequence; and united their force against those, who thought it their duty to represent the Deity, as extending his goodness and mercy to *all mankind*. This gave rise, soon after the commencement of this century, to a deplorable schism, which all the efforts of human wisdom have since been unable to heal. The Arminian schism.
JAMES ARMINIUS, professor of divinity in the university of *Leyden*, rejected the doctrine of the church of *Geneva*, in relation to the deep and intricate points of predestination and grace; and maintained, with the Lutherans, that God has excluded none from salvation by an *absolute* and eternal decree. He was joined in these sentiments by several persons in *Holland*, that were eminently distinguished by the extent of their learning and the dignity of their stations; but he met with the warmest opposition from FRANCIS GOMAR his colleague, and from the principal professors of the Dutch universities. The magistrates exhorted the contending parties to moderation and charity; and observed, that, in a free state, their respective opinions might be treated with toleration, without any detriment to the essential interests of true religion. After long and tedious debates, which were frequently attended with popular tumults and civil broils, this intricate controversy was, by the counsels and authority [d] of MAURICE, prince of *Orange*, referred to the decision of the church, assembled, in a general synod at *Dort*, in the year 1618. The most eminent divines of the United Provinces, and not only so, but learned deputies from the churches of *England*, *Scotland*, *Switzerland*, *Bremen*, *Hessia*, and the *Palatinate*, were present at this numerous and solemn assembly. It was by the sentence of these judges, that the *Arminians* lost their cause, and were declared corrupters of the true religion. It must be observed, at the same time, that the doctors of *Geneva*, who embraced the *Sublapsarian* system, triumphed over their adversaries in this synod. For though the patrons of the *Supralapsarian* cause were far from being contemptible either in point of number or of abilities; yet the moderation and equity of the British divines prevented the synod from giving its sanction to the opinions of that presumptuous sect. Nor indeed would even the *Sublapsarians* have gained their point, or obtained to the full the accomplishment of their desires, had the doctors of *Bremen*, who for weighty reasons were attached to the Lutherans, been able to execute their purposes [e].

XII. It is greatly to be doubted, whether this victory, gained over the *Arminians*, was, upon the whole, advantageous or detrimental to the church The effects of this schism.

[(d) It was not by the authority of Prince MAURICE, but by that of the States general, that the national synod was assembled at *Dort*. The states were not indeed unanimous; three of the seven provinces protested against the holding of this synod, viz. *Holland*, *Utrecht*, and *Overyssel*.]

[e] We shall give, in the *History of the Arminians*, a list of the writers that appeared in this controversy; as also a more particular account of the transactions of the synod of *Dort*.

CENT. XVII. of *Geneva* in particular, and to the Reformed church in general. It is at least certain, that, after the synod of *Dort*, the doctrine of absolute decrees lost ground from day to day; and its patrons were put to the hard necessity of holding fraternal communion with those, whose doctrine was either professedly Arminian, or, at least, nearly resembled it. The leaders of the vanquished Arminians were eminently distinguished by their eloquence, sagacity, and learning; and being highly exasperated by the injurious and oppressive treatment they met with, in consequence of their condemnation, they defended themselves and attacked their adversaries with such spirit and vigour, and also with such dexterity and eloquence, that multitudes were persuaded of the justice of their cause. It is particularly to be observed, that the authority of the synod of *Dort* was far from being universally acknowledged among the Dutch; the provinces of *Friesland*, *Zeland*, *Utrecht*, *Guelderland*, and *Groningen*, could not be persuaded to adopt its decisions; and though, in the year 1651, they were at length gained over so far as to intimate, that they would see with pleasure the Reformed religion maintained upon the footing on which it had been placed and confirmed by the synod of *Dort*, yet the most eminent adepts in Belgic jurisprudence deny that this intimation has the force or character of a law [f].

In *England* the face of religion changed considerably, in a very little time after the famous synod now mentioned; and this change, which was entirely in favour of *Arminianism*, was principally effected by the counsels and influence of WILLIAM LAUD, archbishop of *Canterbury*. This revolution gave new courage to the Arminians; and, from that period to the present time, they have had the pleasure of seeing the decisions and doctrines of the synod of *Dort*, relating to the points in debate between them and the Calvinists, treated, in *England*, with something more than mere indifference, beheld by some with aversion, and by others with contempt [g]. And indeed, if we consider the genius and spirit of the church of *England* during this period, we shall plainly see, that the doctrine of the *Gomarists*, concerning Predestination and Grace, could not meet there with a favourable reception, since the leading doctors of that church were zealous in modelling its doctrine and discipline after the sentiments and institutions that were received in the primitive times, and since those early fathers, whom they followed with a profound submission, had never presumed, before AUGUSTIN, to set limits to the extent of the divine grace and mercy.

The Reformed churches in *France* seemed, at first, disposed to give a favourable reception to the decisions of this famous synod; but as these decisions were highly displeasing to the votaries of *Rome* among whom they lived, and kindled anew their rage against the Protestants, the latter thought it their duty to be circumspect in this matter; and, in process of time, their

[f] See the very learned and illustrious president BYNKERSHOEK's *Quæstiones juris publici*, lib. ii. cap. xviii.

[g] SEV. LINTRUPII *Dissertatio de Contemptu Concilii Dordrac. in Anglia*, in *Dissert. Theologicis* HECT. GODOFR. MASII, tom. i. n. xix.

real sentiments and the doctrines they taught began to differ extremely from those of the *Gomarists*. The churches of *Brandenburg* and *Bremen*, which made a considerable figure among the *Reformed* in *Germany*, would never suffer their doctors to be tied down to the opinions and tenets of the Dutch divines. And thus it happened, that the liberty of private judgment (with respect to the doctrines of *Predestination* and *Grace*) which the spirit that prevailed among the divines of *Dort* seemed so much adapted to suppress or discourage, acquired rather new vigour, in consequence of the arbitrary proceedings of that assembly; and the *Reformed* church was immediately divided into *Universalists*, *Semi-universalists*, *Supralapsarians*, and *Sublapsarians*, who, indeed, notwithstanding their dissensions, which sometimes become violent and tumultuous, live generally in the exercise of mutual toleration, and are reciprocally restrained by many reasons from indulging a spirit of hostility and persecution. What is still more remarkable, and therefore ought not to be passed over in silence, we see the city of *Geneva*, which was the parent, the nurse, and the guardian of the doctrine of *Absolute Predestination* and *Particular Grace*, not only put on sentiments of charity, forbearance, and esteem for the *Arminians*, but become itself almost so far *Arminian*, as to deserve a place among the churches of that communion.

XIII. While the *Reformed* churches in *France* yet subsisted, its doctors departed, in several points, from the common rule of faith that was received in the other churches of their communion. This, as appears from several circumstances, was, in a great measure, owing to their desire of diminishing the prejudices of the *Roman-catholics* against them, and of getting rid of a part of the odious conclusions, which were drawn by their adversaries from the doctrines of *Dort*, and laid to their charge with that malignity which popish bigotry so naturally inspires. Hence we find in the books, that were composed by the doctors of *Saumur* and *Sedan*, after the synod of *Dort*, many things which seem conformable, not only to the sentiments of the *Lutherans*, concerning *Grace*, *Predestination*, the *Person of Christ*, and the *Efficacy of the sacraments*, but also to certain peculiar opinions of the *Romish* church. This moderation may be dated from the year 1615, when the opinion of *JOHN PISCATOR*, pastor at *Herborn*, concerning the *Obedience of Christ*, was tacitly adopted, or at least pronounced free from error, by the synod of the isle of *France* [b]; though it had been formerly condemned and rejected in several preceding assemblies of the same nature [i]. Pis-

The particular tenets of the Reformed churches in *France*.

[b] *AYMON*, *Actes de tous les Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Reformées de France*, tom. ii. p. 275, 276.

[i] See *AYMON*, *loc. cit.* tom. i. p. 301. 400. 457. tom. ii. p. 13.—*BOSSUET*, *Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes*, livr. xii. tom. ii. p. 268. where this prelate, with his usual malignity and bitterness, reproaches the Protestants with their inconstancy. The learned *BASNAGE* has endeavoured to defend the *Reformed* churches against this charge, in the second volume of his *Histoire de l'Eglise*, p. 1533. But [this defence is not satisfactory. [To *Dr. MOSHEIM*, who speaks more than once of the *Reformed* church and its doctors with partiality and prejudice, this defence may not appear satisfactory; it has, nevertheless, been judged so by many persons of uncommon discernment, and we invite the reader to judge for himself.]

CENT. XVII. CATOR maintained, that it was not by his obedience to the divine law that CHRIST made a satisfaction to that law in our stead, since this obedience was his duty considered as a man; and therefore, being obliged to obey this law himself, his observance of it could not merit any thing for others from the supreme Being. This opinion, as every one may see, tended to confirm the doctrine of the Romish church, concerning the *Merit of good works*, the *Natural power of man to obey the commands of God*, and other points of a like nature. These less important concessions were followed by others of a much more weighty and momentous kind, of which some were so erroneous, that they were highly disliked and rejected, even by those of the French Protestants themselves, who were the most remarkable for their moderation, charity, and love of peace [k].

The controversy
excited by the
Hypothetical
Universalists.

XIV. The doctors of *Saumur* revived a controversy, that had, for some time, been suspended, by their attempts to reconcile the doctrine of Predestination, as it had been taught at *Geneva*, and confirmed at *Dort*, with the sentiments of those, who represent the Deity as offering the displays of his goodness and mercy to all mankind. The first person, who made this fruitless attempt, was JOHN CAMERON, whose sentiments were supported and further illustrated by MOSES AMYRAUT, a man of uncommon sagacity and erudition. The latter applied himself, from the year 1634, with unparalleled zeal, to this arduous work, and displayed in it extraordinary exertions of capacity and genius; and so ardently was he bent on bringing it into execution, that he made, for this purpose, no small changes in the doctrine commonly received among the Reformed in *France*. The form of doctrine he had struck out, in order to accomplish this important reconciliation, may be briefly summed up in the following propositions: "That God *desires* the happiness of all men, and that no mortal is excluded, by any divine decree, from the benefits that are procured by the death, sufferings, and Gospel of CHRIST;

[(k) This affirmation is groundless, and I wish it were not liable to the charge of malignity. The accusation that Dr. MOSHEIM brings here against the Reformed churches in *France* is of too serious a nature not to require the most evident and circumstantial proofs. He has, however, alledged none; nor has he given any one instance of those *weighty and momentous concessions* that were made to popery. It was not, indeed, in his power either to give arguments or examples of a satisfactory kind; and it is highly probable, that the unguarded words of ELIAS SAURIN, minister of *Utrecht*, in relation to the learned LEWIS LE BLANC, professor of *Sedan* (which dropt from the pen of the former, in his *Examen de la Theologie de M. JURIEU*) are the only testimony Dr. MOSHEIM had to alledge, in support of an accusation, which he has not limited to any one person, but inconsiderately thrown out upon the French churches in general. Those, who are desirous of a full illustration of this matter, and yet have not an opportunity of consulting the original sources of information, may satisfy their curiosity by perusing the articles BEAULIEU and AMIRAUT, in BAYLE's *Dictionary*; and the articles PAJON and PAPIN, in M. DE CHAUFFEPIED's *Supplement* to that work. Any concessions that seem to have been made by the Protestant doctors in *France* to their adversaries, consisted in giving an Arminian turn to some of the more rigid tenets of CALVIN, relating to *Original Sin*, *Predestination*, and *Grace*; and this turn would, undoubtedly, have been given to these doctrines, had popery been out of the question. But these concessions are not certainly what our historian had in view; nor would he, in effect, have treated such concessions as erroneous.]

“That, however, none can be made a partaker of the blessings of the Gospel, and of eternal salvation, unless he *believe* in JESUS CHRIST; CENT. XVII.

“That, such indeed is the immense and universal goodness of the supreme Being, that he *refuses* to *none* the *power* of *believing*; though he does not grant unto *all* his assistance and succour, that they may wisely improve this *power* to the attainment of everlasting salvation;

“And that, in consequence of this, multitudes perish, through their own fault, and not from any want of goodness in God [l].”

Those, who embraced this doctrine, were called *Universalists*, because they represented God, as willing to shew mercy to *all* mankind; and *Hypothetical Universalists*, because the *condition* of faith in CHRIST was necessary to render them the objects of this mercy. It is the opinion of many, that this doctrine differs but little from that which was established by the synod of *Dort*; but such do not seem to have attentively considered either the principles from whence it is derived, or the consequences to which it leads. The more I examine this reconciling system, the more am I persuaded, that it is no more than Arminianism or Pelagianism artfully dressed up, and ingeniously covered with a half-transparent veil of specious, but ambiguous expressions; and this judgment is confirmed by the language, that is used in treating this subject by the modern followers of AMYRAUT, who express their sentiments with more courage, plainness, and perspicuity, than the spirit of the times permitted their master to do. A cry was raised, in several French synods, against the doctrine of AMYRAUT; but after it had been carefully examined by *them*, and defended by *him* at their public meetings with his usual eloquence and erudition, he was honourably acquitted [m]. The opposition he met with from *Holland* was still more formidable, as it came from the learned and celebrated pens of RIVET, SPANHEIM, DES MARETS, and other adversaries of note; he nevertheless answered them with great spirit and vigour, and his cause was powerfully supported afterwards by DAILLE, BLONDEL, MESTREZAT, and CLAUDE [n]. This controversy was carried on, for a long time, with great animosity and little fruit to those, who opposed the opinions of the French innovator. For the sentiments of AMYRAUT were not only received in all the universities of the Hugonots in *France*, and adopted by divines of the highest note in that nation, but also spread themselves as far as *Geneva*, and were afterwards diffeminated by the French Protestants, who fled from the rage of persecution, through all the Reformed churches of *Europe*. And they now are so generally received, that few have the courage to oppose or decry them.

XV. The desire of mitigating certain doctrines of the Reformed church, that drew upon it the heaviest censures from both the Roman-catholics and The contests occasioned by De la Place and Cappel.

[l] See JO. WOLFG. JAEGERI *Historia Eccles. et Politica, Sæculi xvii. Decenn. iv. p. 522.*

[m] See AYMONT, *Actes des Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Reformées en France*, tom. ii. p. 571. p. 604.—BLONDEL, *Actes Authentiques des Eglises Reformées touchant la paix et la charité Fraternelle*, p. 19—82.—Edit. of Amsterdam published in 4^{to}. in the year 1655.

[n] BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, vol. i. at the articles AMYRAUT and BLONDEL; and vol. ii. at the article DAILLE.—See CHRIST. PFAFFIUS, *De formula consensus*, cap. i. p. 4.

some

CENT. XVII. some Protestant communions, was the true origin of the opinion propagated, in the year 1640, by DE LA PLACE, concerning the imputation of original sin. This divine, who was the intimate friend of AMYRAUT, and his colleague at *Saumur*, rejected the opinion generally received in the schools of the Reformed, that *the personal and actual transgression of the first man is imputed to his posterity*. He maintained, on the contrary, that God imputes to every man his natural corruption, his personal guilt, and his propensity to sin; or, to speak in the theological style, he affirmed, that *original sin is indirectly and not directly imputed to mankind*. This opinion was condemned as erroneous, in the year 1642, by the synod of *Charenton*, and many Dutch and Helvetic doctors of great name set themselves to refute it [o]; while the love of peace and union prevented its author from defending it in a public and open manner [p]. But neither the sentence of the synod nor the silence of DE LA PLACE could hinder this sentiment from making a deep impression on the minds of many, who looked upon it as conformable to the plainest dictates of justice and equity, nor from being transmitted, with the French exiles, into other countries.

In the class of those, who, to diminish or avoid the resentment of the papists, made concessions inconsistent with truth, and detrimental to the purity of the Protestant religion, many place LEWIS CAPPEL, professor at *Saumur*, who, in a voluminous and elaborate work [q], undertook to prove that the Hebrew points were not used by the sacred writers, and were a modern invention added to the text by the Masorethes [r]. It is at least certain, that this hypothesis was highly agreeable to the votaries of *Rome*, and seemed manifestly adapted to diminish the authority of the holy Scriptures, and to put them upon a level with oral tradition, if not to render their decisions still less respectable and certain [s]. On these accounts, the system of this famous professor was opposed with the most ardent efforts of erudition and zeal by several doctors both of the Reformed and Lutheran churches, who were eminent for their knowledge of the Hebrew language, and their acquaintance with Oriental learning in general [t].

[o] AYMON, *Synodes des Eglises Reformées de France*, tom. ii. p. 680.

[p] CHRIST. EBERH. WEISMANNI *Histor. Eccles. Sæc. xvii.* p. 817.

[q] This work, which is entitled, *Arcanum Punctationis Revelatum*, is still extant with its *Vindiciæ* in the works of CAPPEL, printed at *Amsterdam*, in the year 1689, in *folio*, and in the *Critica Sacra* V. T. published in *folio* at *Paris* 1650.

[(r)] It was also CAPPEL who affirmed, that the characters, which compose the Hebrew text, were those, that the Chaldeans used after the Babylonish captivity, the Jews having always made use of the Samaritain characters before that period.]

[(s)] This absurd notion of the tendency of CAPPEL's hypothesis is now hissed almost entirely out of the learned world. Be that as it may, the hypothesis in question is, by no means, peculiar to CAPPEL; it was adopted by LUTHER, ZUINGLE, CALVIN, the three great pillars of the reformation; as also by MUNSTER, OLIVETAN, MASIUS, SCALIGER, CASAUBON, DRUSIUS, DE DIEU, WALTON, and BOCHART, those eminent men, who have cast such light on sacred philology; so that CAPPEL had only the merit of supporting it by new arguments, and placing it in a striking and luminous point of view.]

[t] See B. JO. CHRIST. WOLFII *Biblioth. Hebraica*, p. ii. p. 27.

XVI. Though these great men gave offence to many, by the freedom and novelty of their sentiments, yet they had the approbation and esteem of the greatest part of the Reformed churches; and the equity of succeeding generations removed the aspersions that envy had thrown upon them during their lives, and made ample amends for the injuries they had received from several of their cotemporaries. This was far from being the case of those doctors, who either openly attempted to bring about a compleat reconciliation and union between the Reformed and Romish churches, or explained the doctrines of Christianity in such a manner as lessened the difference between the two communions, and thereby rendered the passage from the former to the latter less disgusting and painful. The attempts of these peace-makers were looked upon as odious, and in the issue they proved utterly unsuccessful. The most eminent of these reconciling doctors were LEWIS LE BLANC, professor at Sedan, and CLAUDE PAJON, minister of Orleans [u], who were both remarkable for the persuasive power of their eloquence, and discovered an uncommon degree of penetration and sagacity in their writings and negociations. The former passed in review many of the controversies that divide the two churches, and seemed to prove, with the utmost perspicuity, that some of them were merely disputes about words, and that the others were of much less consequence than was generally imagined [w]. This manner of stating the differences between the two churches drew upon LE BLANC the indignation of those, who looked upon all attempts to soften and modify controverted doctrines as dangerous and detrimental to the cause of truth [x]. On the other hand, the acuteness and dexterity with which he treated this nice matter made a considerable impression upon several persons, and procured him disciples, who still entertain his reconciling sentiments, but either conceal them entirely, or discover them with caution, as they are known to be displeasing to the greatest part of the members of both communions.

CENT. XVII.

Lewis le Blanc.

XVII. The modifications, under which PAJON exhibited some of the doctrines of the Reformed church, were also extremely offensive and unpopular. This ecclesiastic applied the principles and tenets of the Cartesian philosophy, of which he was a warm and able defender, in explaining the opinions of that church relating to the corruption of human nature, the state of its moral faculties and powers, the grace of God, and the conversion of sinners; and, in the judgment of many, he gave an erroneous interpretation of these opinions. It is, indeed, very difficult to determine what

Claude Pajon.

[u] It is difficult to conceive, what could engage Dr. MOSHEIM to place PAJON in the class of those, who explained the doctrines of Christianity in such a manner, as to diminish the difference between the doctrine of the Reformed and Romish churches. PAJON was, indeed, a moderate divine, and leaned somewhat towards the Arminian system; and this propensity was not uncommon among the French Protestants. But few doctors of this time wrote with more learning, zeal, and judgment against popery than CLAUDE PAJON, as appears from his excellent treatise against NICOLE, entitled, *Examen du Livre, qui porte pour titre préjugés légitimes contre les Calvinistes.*

[w] In his *Theses Theologicae*, which have passed through several editions, and are highly worthy of an attentive perusal. They were twice printed at London.

[x] See BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, at the article BEAULIEU.

CENT. XVII.

were the real sentiments of this man; nor is it easy to say, whether this difficulty be most owing to the affected obscurity and ambiguity under which he disguised them, or to the inaccuracy with which his adversaries, through negligence or malignity, have represented them. If we may give credit to the latter, his doctrine amounts to the following propositions: "That the corruption of man is less, and his natural power to amend his ways greater, than is generally imagined:—That *original sin* lies in the understanding alone, and consists principally in the obscurity and imperfection of our ideas of divine things:—That this imperfection of the human understanding has a pernicious influence upon the *will*, excites in it vicious propensities, and thus leads it to sinful actions:—That this internal disorder is healed, not by the mere efforts of our *natural faculties* and powers, but by the assistance and *energy* of the *Holy Spirit*, operating upon the mind by the *divine word* as its *mean* or instrument:—That, however, this word is not endowed with any divine intrinsic energy, either *natural* or *supernatural*, but only with a *moral influence*, i. e. that it corrects and improves the understanding, in the same manner as human truth does, even by imparting clear and distinct notions of spiritual and divine things, and furnishing solid arguments for the truth and divinity of the Christian religion, and its perfect conformity with the dictates of right reason:—And that, of consequence, every man, if no internal or external impediments destroy or suspend the exertion of his natural powers and faculties, may, by the *use of his own reason*, and a careful and assiduous study of the revealed will of God, be enabled to correct what is amiss in his sentiments, affections, and actions, without any extraordinary assistance from the *Holy Ghost* [y]."

Such is the account of the opinions of PAJON that is given by his adversaries. On the other hand, if we take our ideas of his doctrine from himself, we shall find this account disingenuous and erroneous. PAJON intimates plainly his assent to the doctrines, that were confirmed by the synod of Dort, and that are contained in the catechisms and confessions of faith of the Reformed churches; he complains that his doctrine has been ill-understood or willfully perverted; and he observes, that he did not deny entirely an *immediate operation of the Holy Spirit* on the minds of those that are really converted to God, but only such an *immediate operation*, as was not accompanied with the ministry and efficacy of the divine word; or, to express the matter in other terms, he declared that he could not adopt the sentiments of those, who represent that word, as no more than an *instrument* void of intrinsic efficacy, a mere external sign of an *immediate operation of the spirit of God* [z]. This last declaration is, however, both obscure and cap-

[y] FRED. SPANHEIM, *Append. ad Elenchum Controversiar.* tom. iii. opp. p. 882.—JURIEU, *Traité de la Nature et de la Grace*, p. 35.—VAL. ERN. LOSCHERI *Exercit. de* CLAUD. PAJONII *ejusque sectator. doctrina et fatis.* Lips. 1692.

[z] All these declarations made by PAJON may be seen in a confession of his faith, supposed to have been drawn up by himself, and published by the learned M. DE CHAUFEPED, in his *Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. et Critique*, tom. ii. p. 164. in note (c) of the article LE CENE.

tious. Be that as it may, PAJON concludes by observing that we ought CENT. XVII.
not to dispute about the *manner* in which the Holy Spirit operates upon the
minds of men, but content ourselves with acknowledging, that he is the
true and original author of all that is good in the affections of our heart,
and the actions that proceed from them. Notwithstanding these decla-
rations, the doctrine of this learned and ingenious ecclesiastic was not only
looked upon as heterodox by some of the most eminent divines of the Re-
formed church, but was also condemned, in the year 1677, by several synods
in *France*, and, in 1686, by a synod assembled at *Rotterdam*.

XVIII. This controversy, which seemed to be brought to a conclusion by Papin.
the death of PAJON, was revived, or rather continued, by ISAAC PAPIN, his
nephew, a native of *Blois*, who, by his writings and travels, was highly in-
strumental in communicating to *England*, *Holland*, and *Germany*, the con-
tagion of these unhappy debates. This ecclesiastic expressed his sentiments
without ambiguity or reserve, and propagated every where the doctrine of
his uncle, which, according to his crude and harsh manner of representing it,
he reduced to the two following propositions :

“*That the natural powers and faculties of man are more than sufficient to lead
him to the knowledge of divine truth :*

“*That in order to produce that amendment of the heart, which is called
REGENERATION, nothing more is requisite than to put the body, if its habit is
bad, into a sound state by the power of physic, and then to set truth and falsehood
before the UNDERSTANDING, and virtue and vice before the WILL, in their
genuine colours, clearly and distinctly, so as that their nature and properties may
be fully apprehended.*”

This and the other opinions of PAPIN were refuted with a considerable
degree of acrimony, in the year 1686, by the famous JURIEU, professor of
divinity and pastor of the French church at *Rotterdam*, and they were con-
demned the year following by the synod of *Boisleduc*. In the year 1688,
they were condemned with still greater marks of severity by the French
synod of *Hague*, where a sentence of excommunication was pronounced
against their author. Exasperated at these proceedings, PAPIN returned into
France in the year 1690, where he abjured publicly the Protestant religion,
and embraced the communion of the church of *Rome*, in which he died in
the year 1709 [a]. It has been affirmed by some, that this ingenious man
was treated with great rigour and injustice, and that his theological opinions
were unfaithfully represented by his violent and unrelenting adversary,
JURIEU, whose warmth and impetuosity in religious controversy are well
known. How far this affirmation may be supported by evidence we can-
not pretend to determine. A doctrine something like that of PAJON was Le Cene.
maintained in several treatises, in the year 1684, by CHARLES LE CENE, a
French divine of uncommon learning and sagacity, who gave a new and
very singular translation of the Bible [b]. But he entirely rejected the

[a] See JURIEU, *De la Nature et de la Grace*.—MOLLERI *Cimbria Litterat.* tom. ii. p. 608.

[b] This translation was published at *Amsterdam* in the year 1741, and was condemned by the
French synod in *Holland*.

CENT. XVII. doctrine of *Original Sin*, and of the impotence of human nature; and asserted, that it was in every man's power to amend his ways, and arrive at a state of obedience and virtue, by the mere use of his natural faculties and an attentive study of the divine word; more especially, if these were seconded by the advantage of a good education, and the influence of virtuous examples. Hence several divines pretend that his doctrine is, in many respects, different from that of PAJON [c].

The state of
the church of
England under
James I.

XIX. The church of *England* had, for a long time, resembled a ship tossed on a boisterous and tempestuous ocean. The opposition of the *Papists* on the one hand, and the discontents and remonstrances of the *Puritans* on the other, had kept it in a perpetual ferment. When, on the death of ELIZABETH, JAMES I ascended the throne, these latter conceived the warmest hopes of seeing more serene and prosperous days, and of being delivered from the vexations and oppressions, they were constantly exposed to on account of their attachment to the discipline and worship of the church of *Geneva*. These hopes were so much the more natural, as the king had received his education in *Scotland*, where the *Puritans* prevailed, and had, on some occasions, made the strongest declarations of his attachment to their ecclesiastical constitution [d]. And some of the first steps taken by this prince seemed to encourage these hopes, as he appeared desirous of assuming the character and office of an arbitrator, in order to accommodate matters between the church and the *Puritans* [e]. But these expectations soon

[c] See the learned and laborious M. CHAUFFEPED's *Nouv. Diction. Hist. et Critiq.* tom. ii. p. 160. at the article LE CENE.

[d] In a general assembly held at *Edinburgh*, in the year 1590, this prince is said to have made the following public declaration: "I praise God that I was born in the time of the light of the Gospel, and in such a place, as to be the king of the sincerest (i. e. purest) kirk in the world. The kirk of *Geneva* keep pasche and yule (i. e. *Easter* and *Christmas*). What have they for them? They have no institution. As for our neighbour kirk of *England*, their service is an evil-said mass in English; they want nothing of the mass, but the liftings (i. e. the elevation of the host). I charge you, my good ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity, and to exhort your people to do the same; and I, forsooth, as long as I brook my life, shall do the same." CALDERWOOD's *History of the Church of Scotland*, p. 256.]

[e] The religious disputes between the church and the *Puritans* induced JAMES to appoint a conference between the two parties at *Hampton-Court*; at which nine bishops and as many dignitaries of the church appeared on the one side, and four Puritan ministers on the other. The king himself took a considerable part in the controversy against the latter. And this was an occupation well adapted to his taste; for nothing could be more pleasing to this royal pedant, than to dictate magisterially to an assembly of divines concerning points of faith and discipline, and to receive the applauses of these holy men for his superior zeal and learning. The conference continued three days. The first day it was held between the king and the bishops and deans, to whom JAMES proposed some objections against certain expressions in the liturgy, and a few alterations in the ritual of the church; in consequence of which, some slight alterations were made. The two following days the *Puritans* were admitted, whose proposals and remonstrances may be seen in NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 15. Dr. WARNER, in his *Ecclesiastical History of England*, observes, that this author must be read with caution on account of his unfairness and partiality; why therefore did he not take his account of the *Hampton-Court* conference from a better source? The different accounts of the opposite parties, and more particularly those published by Dr. BARLOW dean of *Chester*, on the one hand, and PATRIC GALLOWAY, a Scots writer, on the other (both of whom were present at the conference) must be carefully consulted, in order to our forming a proper idea of these theological transactions. JAMES at least obtained, on this occasion, vanished,

vanished, and, under the government of JAMES, things put on a new face. As the desire of unlimited power and authority was the reigning passion in the heart of this monarch, so all his measures, whether of a civil or religious nature, were calculated to answer the purposes of his ambition. The *Presbyterian* form of ecclesiastical government seemed less favourable to his views than the *episcopal hierarchy*; as the former exhibits a kind of *republic*, which is administered by various rulers of equal authority; while the latter approaches much nearer to the spirit and genius of *monarchy*. The very name of a *republic*, *synod*, or *council*, was odious to JAMES, who dreaded every thing, that had a popular aspect; hence he distinguished the bishops with peculiar marks of his favour, extended their authority, increased their prerogatives, and publicly adopted and inculcated the following maxim, *No bishop, no king*. At the same time, as the church of *England* had not yet abandoned the Calvinistical doctrines of *Predestination* and *Grace*, he also adhered to them for some time, and gave his theological representatives in the synod of *Dort*, an order to join in the condemnation of the sentiments of ARMINIUS, in relation to these deep and intricate points. ABBOT archbishop of *Canterbury*, a man of remarkable gravity [f], and eminent zeal both for civil and religious liberty, whose lenity towards their ancestors the *Puritans* still celebrate in the highest strains [g], used his utmost endeavours to confirm the king in the principles of calvinism, to which he himself was thoroughly attached. But scarcely had the British divines returned from the synod of *Dort*, and given an account of the laws that had been enacted and the doctrines that had been established by that famous assembly, than the king, together with the greatest part of the episcopal clergy, discovered, in the strongest terms, their dislike of these proceedings, and judged the sentiments of ARMINIUS, relating to the divine decrees, preferable to those of GOMARUS and CALVIN [b]. This sudden and unexpected change, in

the applause he had in view. The archbishop of *Canterbury* (WHITGIFT) said, *That undoubtedly his majesty spoke by the special assistance of God's spirit*; and BANCROFT falling on his knees, with his eyes raised to — JAMES, expressed himself thus: *I protest my heart melteth for joy, that Almighty God, of his singular mercy, has given us such a king, as since CHRIST's time has not been.*

[f] Lord CLARENDON says, in his *History of the Rebellion*, that "ABBOT was a man of very morose manners, and of a very sower aspect, which at that time was called *Gravity*." If, in general, we strike a medium between what CLARENDON and NEAL say of this prelate, we shall probably arrive at the true knowledge of his character. See the *History of the Rebellion*, vol. i. p. 88. and NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 243.]

[g] See ANTON. WOOD, *Athenæ Oxoniens.* tom. i. p. 583. — NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. ch. iv. p. 242. — CLARENDON's *History of the Rebellion*, vol. i.

[b] See HEYLIN's *History of the Five Articles*. — NEAL, *ibid.* vol. ii. ch. ii. p. 117. This latter author tells us, that the following verses were made in *England* with a design to pour contempt on the synod of *Dort*, and to turn its proceedings into ridicule:

*Dordrechtii Synodus, Nodus; Chorus Integer, Æger;
Conventus, Ventus; Sessio, Stramen. Amen.*

[* It would be a difficult, nay an unsurmountable, task to justify all the proceedings of the synod of *Dort*; and it were much to be wished, that they had been more conformable to the spirit of Christian charity, than the representations of history, impartially weighed, shew them to have been. We are not, however, to conclude from the insipid, monkish lines here quoted by Dr. MOSHEIM, that the transactions and decisions of that synod were universally condemned or despised in *England*. It had its partisans in the established church, as well as among the *Puritans*; and its decisions, in point of doctrine, were looked upon by many, and not without reason, as agreeable to the tenour of the *Book of Articles established by law in the church of England*.]

the

CENT. XVII. the theological opinions of the court and clergy, was certainly owing to a variety of reasons, as will appear evident to those, who have any acquaintance with the spirit and transactions of these times. The principal one, if we are not deceived, must be sought in the plans of a further reformation of the church of *England*, that were proposed by several eminent ecclesiastics, whose intention was to bring it to as near a resemblance, as was possible, of the primitive church. And every one knows that the peculiar doctrines, to which the victory was assigned by the synod of *Dort*, were absolutely unknown in the first ages of the Christian church [i]. Be that as it may, this change was fatal to the interests of the *Puritans*; for the king, being indisposed to the opinions and institutions of Calvinism, the *Puritans* were left without defence, and exposed anew to the animosity and hatred of their

With respect to JAMES, those, who are desirous of forming a just idea of the character, proceedings, and theological fickleness and inconstancy of that monarch, must peruse the writers of English history, more especially LARREY and RAPIN THOYRAS. The greatest part of these writers tell us, that, towards the latter end of his days, JAMES, after having deserted from the Calvinists to the Arminians, began to discover a singular propensity towards popery; and they affirm positively, that he entertained the most ardent desire of bringing about a union between the church of *England* and the church of *Rome*. In this, however, these writers seem to have gone too far; for though many of the proceedings of this injudicious prince deserve justly the sharpest censure, yet it is both rash and unjust to accuse him of a design to introduce popery into *England*. It is not to be believed, that a prince, who aspired after arbitrary power and uncontrouled dominion, could ever have entertained a thought of submitting to the yoke of the Roman pontif†. The truth of the matter seems to be this, that, towards the latter end of his reign, JAMES began to have less aversion to the doctrines and rites of the Romish church, and permitted certain religious observances, that were conformable to the spirit of that church, to be used in *England*. This conduct was founded upon a manner of reasoning, which he had learned from several bishops of his time, (*viz.*) That the primitive church is the model which all Christian churches ought to imitate in doctrine and worship; that in proportion as any church approaches to this primitive standard of truth and purity, it must become proportionably pure and perfect; and that the Romish church retained more of the *spirit* and *manner* of the primitive church, than the Puritan or Calvinist churches. [Of these three propositions, the two first are undoubtedly true, and the last as evidently and demonstrably false. Besides; this makes nothing to the argument. For as JAMES had a manifest aversion to the *Puritans*, it could, in his eyes, be no very great recommendation of the Romish church, that it surpassed that of the *Puritans* in doctrine and discipline.]

[(i) Dr. MOSHEIM has annexed the following note to this passage: "Perhaps the king entered into these ecclesiastical proceedings with the more readiness, when he reflected on the civil commotions and tumults, that an attachment to the *Presbyterian* religion had occasioned in *Scotland*. There are also some circumstances, that intimate plainly enough, that JAMES, before his accession to the crown of *England*, was very far from having an aversion to popery." Thus far the note of our author, and whoever looks into the *Historical view of the Negotiations between the Courts of England, France, and Brussels, from the year 1592 to 1617, extracted from the MSS. State-Papers of Sir THOMAS EDMONDES and ANTHONY BACON, Esq.* and published, in the year 1749, by the learned and judicious Dr. BIRCH, will be persuaded, that, towards the year 1595, this fickle and unsteady prince had really formed a design to embrace the faith of *Rome*. See, in the curious collection now mentioned, the *Postscript* of a letter from Sir THOMAS EDMONDES to the Lord High-Treasurer, dated the 20th of December, 1595. We learn also from the *Memoirs* of Sir RALPH WINWOOD, that, in the year 1596, JAMES sent Mr. OGILBY, a Scots baron, into *Spain*, to assure his catholic majesty, that he was then ready and resolved to embrace popery, and to propose an alliance with that king and the pope against the queen of *England*. See *State-Tracts*, vol. i. p. 1.]

[† This remark is confuted by fact, observation, and the perpetual contradictions that are observable in the conduct of men. Besides, see the note (i).]

adversaries,

adversaries, which had been, for some time, suspended, but now broke out with redoubled vehemence, and at length kindled a religious war, whose consequences were deplorable beyond expression. In the year 1625, died JAMES I, the bitterest enemy of the doctrine and discipline of the Puritans; to which he had been in his youth most warmly attached, the most inflexible and ardent patron of the Arminians, in whose ruin and condemnation in *Holland* he had been singularly instrumental, and the most zealous defender of episcopal government, against which he had more than once expressed himself in the strongest terms. He left the constitution of *England*, both ecclesiastical and civil, in a very unsettled and fluctuating state, languishing under intestine disorders of various kinds.

XX. His son and successor CHARLES I, who had imbibed his political and religious principles, had nothing so much at heart as to bring to perfection what his father had left unfinished. All the exertions of his zeal, and the whole tenour of his administration, were directed towards the three following objects: "The extending the royal prerogative and raising the power of the crown above the authority of the law—the reduction of all the churches in *Great-Britain* and *Ireland* under the jurisdiction of bishops, whose government he looked upon as of divine institution, and also as the most adapted to guard the privileges and majesty of the throne—and lastly, the suppression of the opinions and institutions that were peculiar to Calvinism, and the modelling of the doctrine, discipline, ceremonies, and polity of the church of *England*, after the spirit and constitution of the primitive church." The person, whom the king chiefly intrusted with the execution of this arduous plan, was WILLIAM LAUD, bishop of *London*, who was afterwards raised, in the year 1633, to the see of *Canterbury*, and exhibited, in these high stations, a mixed character, composed of great qualities and great defects. The voice of justice must celebrate his erudition, his fortitude, his ingenuity, his zeal for the sciences, and his munificence and liberality to men of letters; and, at the same time, even charity must acknowledge with regret, his inexcusable imprudence, his excessive superstition, his excessive attachment to the sentiments, rites, and institutions of the ancient church, which made him behold the Puritans and Calvinists with horror [k]; and that violent spirit of animosity and persecution, that discovered itself in the whole course of his ecclesiastical administration [l]. This haughty prelate executed the plans of his royal master, and fulfilled the views of his own ambition, without using those mild and moderate methods, that prudence employs to make unpopular schemes go down. He carried things with a high hand; when he found the laws opposing his

The state of
the church of
England under
Charles I.

[k] See ANT. WOOD, *Athenæ Oxoniens.* tom. ii. p. 55.—HEYLIN's *Cyprianus*, or the *History of the Life and Death of WILLIAM LAUD*, published at *London* in 1668.—CLARENDON's *History*, vol. i.

[l] "Sincere he undoubtedly was (says Mr. HUME), and, however misguided, actuated by religious principles in all his pursuits; and it is to be regretted, that a man of such spirit, who conducted his enterprizes with such warmth and industry had not entertained more enlarged views, and embraced principles more favourable to the general happiness of human society."

views,

CENT. XVII. views, he treated them with contempt, and violated them without hesitation; he loaded the Puritans with injuries and vexations, and aimed at nothing less than their total extinction; he rejected the Calvinistical doctrine of Predestination publicly in the year 1625; and, notwithstanding the opposition and remonstrances of ABBOT, substituted the Arminian system in its place [m]; he revived many religious rites and ceremonies, which, though stamped with the sanction of antiquity, were nevertheless marked with the turpitude of superstition, and had been justly abrogated on that account; he forced bishops upon the Scots nation, which was zealously attached to the discipline and ecclesiastical polity of Geneva, and had shewn, on all occasions, the greatest reluctance against an episcopal government; and, lastly, he gave many and very plain intimations, that he looked upon the Romish church, with all its errors, as more pure, more holy, and preferable upon the whole, to those Protestant churches, that were not subject to the jurisdiction of bishops. By these his unpopular sentiments and violent measures, LAUD drew an odium on the king, on himself, and on the episcopal order in general. Hence, in the year 1644, he was brought before the public tribunals of justice, declared guilty of high treason, and condemned to lose his head on a scaffold, which sentence was accordingly executed.

After the death of LAUD, the dissensions that had reigned, for a long time, between the king and parliament, grew still more violent, and arose, at length, to so great a height, that they could not be extinguished but by the blood of that excellent prince. The great council of the nation, heated by the violent suggestions of the *Puritans* and *Independents* [n], abolished episcopal government; condemned and abrogated every thing in the ecclesiastical establishment that was contrary to the doctrine, worship, and discipline of the church of Geneva; turned the vehemence of their opposition against the king himself, and having brought him into their power by the fate of arms, accused him of treason against the majesty of the nation; and, in the year 1648, while the eyes of Europe were fixed with astonishment on this strange spectacle, caused his head to be struck off on a public scaffold. Such are the calamities that flow from religious zeal without knowledge, from that enthusiasm and bigotry that inspire a blind and immoderate attachment to the external and unessential parts of religion, and to certain doctrines ill-understood! These broils and tumults served also unhappily to confirm the truth of an observation often made, that all religious sects, while they are kept under and oppressed, are remarkable for inculcating the duties of moderation, forbearance, and charity towards those who dissent from us; but, as soon as the scenes of persecution are removed, and they, in their turn, arrive at power and pre-eminence, forget their own precepts and maxims, and leave both the recommendation and practice of charity to those that groan under their yoke. Such, in reality, was the conduct and behaviour of the *Puritans* during their transitory exaltation; they shewed as little clemency and equity to the bishops and other patrons of episcopacy, as

[m] See MICH. LE VASSOR, *Hist. de Louis XIII.*, tom. v. p. 262.

[n] The origin of this sect has been already mentioned.

they had received from them when the reins of government were in their hands [o]. CENT. XVII.

XXI. The *Independents*, who have been just mentioned among the promoters of civil discord in *England*, are generally represented by the British writers in a much worse light than the *Presbyterians* or Calvinists. They are commonly accused of various enormities, and are even charged with the crime of parricide, as having born a principal part in the death of the king. But whoever will be at the pains of examining, with impartiality and attention, the writings of that sect, and their confession of faith, must soon perceive, that many crimes have been imputed to them without foundation, and will probably be induced to think that the bold attempts of the civil *Independents* (i. e. of those warm republicans who were the declared enemies of monarchy, and wanted to extend the liberty of the people beyond all bounds of wisdom and prudence) have been unjustly laid to the charge of those *Independents*, whose principles were merely of a religious kind [p]. The religious *Independents* derive their denomination from the

The *Independents*.

[o] Besides CLARENDON and the other writers of English history already mentioned, see NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. and iii.

[p] The sect of the *Independents* is of recent date, and still subsists in *England*; there is, nevertheless, not one, either of the ancient or modern sects of Christians, that is less known, or has been more loaded with groundless aspersions and reproaches. The most eminent English writers, not only among the patrons of episcopacy, but even among those very *Presbyterians* with whom they are now united, have thrown out against them the bitterest accusations and the severest invectives that the warmest indignation could invent. They have not only been represented as delirious, mad, fanatical, illiterate, factious, and ignorant both of natural and revealed religion, but also as abandoned to all kinds of wickedness and sedition, and as the only authors of the odious parricide committed on the person of CHARLES I*. And as the authors, who have given these representations, are considered by foreigners as the best and most authentic relaters of the transactions that have passed in their own country, and are therefore followed as the surest guides, the *Independents* appear, almost every where, under the most unfavourable aspect. It must indeed be candidly acknowledged, that as every class and order of men consists of persons of very different characters and qualities, so also the sect of *Independents* has been dishonoured by several turbulent, factious, profligate and flagitious members. But, if it is a constant maxim with the wise and prudent, not to judge of the spirit and principles of a sect from the actions or expressions of a handful of its members, but from the manners, customs, opinions, and behaviour of the generality of those who compose it, from the writings and discourses of its learned men, and from its public and avowed forms of doctrine and confessions of faith, then, I make no doubt but that, by this rule of estimating matters, the *Independents* will appear to have been unjustly loaded with so many accusations and reproaches.

We shall take no notice of the invidious and severe animadversions that have been made upon this religious community by CLARENDON, ECHARD, PARKER, and so many other writers. To set this whole matter in the clearest and most impartial light, we shall confine ourselves to the account of the *Independents* given by a writer, justly celebrated by the English themselves, and who, though a foreigner, is generally supposed to have had an accurate knowledge of the British nation, its history, its parties, its sects and revolutions. This writer is RAPIN THOYRAS, who (in the twenty-first book of his *History of England*, vol. ii. p. 514. edit. folio) represents the *Independents* under such horrid colours, that, were his portrait just, they would not deserve to enjoy the light of the sun, or to breathe the free air of Britain, much less to be treated with indulgence and esteem

* DURELL (whom nevertheless LEWIS DU MOULIN, the most zealous defender of the *Independents*, commends on account of his ingenuity and candour) in his *Historia Rituum Sanctæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, cap. i. p. 4. expresses himself thus: *Fateor, si atrocis illius Tragædiæ tot ætus fuerint, quot ludicrarum esse solent, postremum fere Independentium fuisse — Adeo ut non acutè magis, quam vere, dixerit L'ESTRANGIUS Noster: Regem primo à Presbyterianis interemptum, CAROLUM deinde ab Independentibus interfectum.*

CENT. XVII. following principle, which they held in common with the *Brownists*, that every Christian congregation ought to be governed by its own laws, without

by those who have the cause of virtue at heart. Let us now examine the account, which this illustrious historian gives of this sect. He declares, in the first place, that, notwithstanding all the pains he had taken to trace out the true origin of it, his inquiries had been entirely fruitless; his words are, as translated by Mr. TINDAL, *After all my pains, I have not been able to discover, precisely, the first rise of the Independent sect, or faction.* It is very surprizing to hear a man of learning, who had employed seventeen years in composing the History of England, and had admittance to so many rich and famous libraries, express his ignorance of a matter, about which it was so easy to acquire ample information. Had he only looked into the work of the learned HORNBECK, entitled, *Summa Controversiarum*, lib. x. p. 775. he would have found, in a moment, what he had been so long and so laboriously seeking in vain. RAPIN proceeds to the doctrines and opinions of the *Independents*, and begins here by a general declaration of their tendency to throw the nation into disorder and combustion; his words are, *Thus much is certain, their principles were very proper to put the kingdom in a flame; and this they did effectually.* What truth there is in this assertion will be seen by what follows. Their sentiments concerning government were, if we are to believe this writer, of the most pernicious kind; since, according to him, they wanted to overturn the monarchy, and to establish a democracy in its place; his words are, *With regard to the state, they abhorred monarchy, and approved only a republican government.* I will not pretend to deny, that there were among the *Independents* several persons, that were no friends to a kingly government; persons of this kind were to be found among the *Presbyterians*, *Anabaptists*, and all the other religious sects and communities that flourished in England during this tumultuous period; but I want to see it proved, in an evident and satisfactory manner, that these republican principles were embraced by all the *Independents*, and formed one of the distinguishing characteristics of that sect. There is, at least, no such thing to be found in their public writings. They declared, on the contrary, in a public memorial drawn up by them in the year 1647, that, as magistracy in general is the ordinance of God, *they do not disapprove of any form of civil government, but do freely acknowledge, that a kingly government, bounded by just and wholesome laws, is both allowed by God, and also a good accommodation unto men.* I omit the mention of several other circumstances, which unite to prove that the *Independents* were far from looking with abhorrence on a monarchical government.

Their sentiments of religion, according to RAPIN's account, were highly absurd, since he represents their principles as entirely opposite to those of all other religious communities: *As to religion,* says he, *their principles were contrary to those of all the rest of the world.* With respect to this accusation, it may be proper to observe, that there are extant two *Confessions of Faith*, one of the English *Independents* in Holland, and another drawn up by the principal members of that community in England. The former was composed by JOHN ROBINSON, the founder of the sect, and was published at Leyden in 4^{to} in the year 1619, under the following title: *Apologia pro exilibus Anglis, qui Brownistæ vulgo appellantur*; the latter appeared at London, for the first time, in the year 1658, and was thus entitled: *A Declaration of the Faith and Order owned and practised in the Congregational Churches in England, agreed upon, and consented unto, by their Elders and Messengers, in their meeting at the Savoy, October 12, 1658.* HORNBECK gave, in the year 1659, a Latin translation of this Declaration, and subjoined it to his *Epistola ad DURÆUM de Independentismo.* It appears evidently from these two public and authentic pieces, not to mention other writings of the *Independents*, that they differed from the *Presbyterians* or Calvinists in no single point of any consequence, except that of ecclesiastical government. To put this matter beyond all doubt, we have only to attend to the following passage in ROBINSON's *Apology for the English exiles*, p. 7. 11. where that founder of the sect of the *Independents* expresses his own private sentiments, and those of his community, in the plainest manner: *Profitemur coram Deo et hominibus, adeo nobis convenire cum Ecclesiis Reformatis Belgicis in re religionis, ut omnibus et singulis earundem Ecclesiarum fidei articulis, prout habentur in Harmonia confessionum fidei, parati sumus subscribere.—Ecclesias Reformatas pro veris et genuinis habemus, cum iisdem in sacris Dei communionem profitemur et, quantum in nobis est, colimus.* It appears evident from this declaration, that, instead of differing totally from all other Christian societies, it may rather be said of the *Independents*, that they were perfectly agreed with by far the greatest part of the Reformed churches. To shew, as he imagines, by a striking example, the absurdity of their religion and worship, our eminent historian tells us, that they not only reject all kind of ecclesiastical government, but moreover allow all their members, promiscuously and without ex-

depending

depending on the jurisdiction of bishops, or being subject to the authority of synods, presbyteries, or any ecclesiastical assembly composed of the depu-

ception, to perform in public the pastoral functions, *i. e.* to preach, pray, and expound the Scriptures; his words are, *They were not only averse to episcopacy and the ecclesiastical hierarchy* (this charge is true, but it may equally be brought against the Presbyterians, Brownists, Anabaptists, and all the various sects of Non-conformists) *but they would not so much as endure ordinary ministers in the church. They maintained, that every man might pray in public, exhort his brethren, and interpret the Scriptures according to the talents God had endued him with.—So with them every one preached, prayed, admonished, interpreted the holy Scriptures, without any other call than what he himself drew from his zeal and supposed gifts, and without any other authority than the approbation of his auditors.* This whole charge is evidently false and groundless. The *Independents* have, and always have had, fixed and regular ministers, approved of by their people; nor do they allow to teach in public every person, who thinks himself qualified for that important office. The celebrated historian has here confounded the *Independents* with the *Brownists*, who, as is well known, permitted all to pray and preach in public without distinction. We shall not enlarge upon the other mistakes he has fallen into on this subject; but only observe, that if so eminent a writer, and one so well acquainted with the English nation, has pronounced such an unjust sentence against this sect, we may the more easily excuse an inferior set of authors, who have loaded them with groundless accusations.

It will however be alledged, that, whatever may have been the religious sentiments and discipline of the *Independents*, innumerable testimonies concur in proving, that they were chargeable with the death of CHARLES I.; and many will consider this single circumstance as a sufficient demonstration of the impiety and depravity of the whole sect. I am well aware, indeed, that many of the most eminent and respectable English writers have given the *Independents* the denomination of *Regicides*; and, if by the term *Independents* they mean those licentious republicans, whose dislike of a monarchical form of government carried them the most pernicious and extravagant lengths, I grant that this denomination is well applied. But, if by the term *Independents* we are to understand a religious sect, the ancestors of those who still bear the same title in England, it appears very questionable to me, whether the unhappy fate of the worthy prince abovementioned ought to be imputed entirely to that set of men. They, who affirm that the *Independents* were the only authors of the death of King CHARLES, must mean one of these two things, either that the *Regicides* were animated and set on by the seditious doctrines of that sect, and the violent suggestions of its members, or that all, who were concerned in this atrocious deed, were themselves *Independents*, zealously attached to the religious community now under consideration. Now it may be proved, with the clearest evidence, that neither of these was the case. There is nothing in the doctrines of this sect, as far as they are known to me, that seems in the least adapted to excite men to such a horrid deed; nor does it appear from the history of these times, that the *Independents* were a whit more exasperated against CHARLES, than were the *Presbyterians*. And as to the latter supposition, it is far from being true, that all those who were concerned in bringing this unfortunate prince to the scaffold were *Independents*; since we learn from the best English writers, and from the public declarations of CHARLES II., that this violent faction was composed of persons of different sects. That there were *Independents* among them may be easily conceived. After all; this matter will be best unravelled by the English writers, who know best in what sense the term *Independents* is used, when it is applied to those who brought CHARLES I. to the block*.

* Dr. MOSHEIM's defence of the *Independents* is certainly specious; but he has not sufficiently distinguished the times; and he has perhaps in defending them strained too far that equitable principle, that we must not impute to a sect any principles that are not contained in, or deducible from, their religious system. This maxim does not entirely answer here the purpose for which it is applied. The religious system of a sect may be in itself pacific and innocent, while, at the same time, certain incidental circumstances, or certain associations of ideas, may render that sect more turbulent and restless than others, or at least involve it in political factions and broils. Such perhaps was the case of the *Independents* at certain periods of time, and more especially at the period now under consideration. When we consider their religious form of government, we shall see evidently, that a principle of analogy (which influences the sentiments and imaginations of men much more than is generally supposed) must naturally have led the greatest part of them to republican notions of civil government; and it is further to be observed, that from a republican government, they must have expected much more protection and favour than from a kingly one. When these two things are considered, together with their situation under the reign of CHARLES I., when the government was unhinged, when all things were in confusion, when the minds of men were suspended upon the issue of the national troubles, and when the eager spirit of party, nourished by hope, made each faction expect that the chaos would end in some settled system

CENT. XVII. ties from different churches [q]. It is in this their notion of ecclesiastical government, that the difference between them and the *Presbyterians* princi-

On inquiring, with particular attention, into the causes of that *odium* that has been cast upon the *Independents*, and of the heavy accusations and severe invectives with which they have been loaded, I was more peculiarly struck with the three following considerations, which will perhaps furnish a satisfactory account of this matter: In the *first place*, the denomination of *Independents* is ambiguous, and is not peculiar to any one distinct order of men. For, not to enumerate the other notions that have been annexed to this term, it is sufficient to observe, that it is used sometimes by the English writers to denote those, who aim at the establishment of a purely *democratical* or popular government, in which the body of the people is clothed with the supreme dominion. Such a faction there was in *England*, composed, in a great measure, of persons of an enthusiastical character and complexion; and to it, no doubt, we are to ascribe those scenes of sedition and misery, whose effects are still lamented with justice. The violence and folly, that dishonoured the proceedings of this tumultuous faction, have been, if I am not mistaken, too rashly imputed to the *religious Independents* now under consideration, who, with all their defects, were a much better sett of men than the persons now mentioned. It may be observed further, *secondly*, that almost all the religious sects, which divided the English nation in the reign of CHARLES I, and more especially under the administration of CROMWELL, assumed the denomination of *Independents*, in order to screen themselves from the reproaches of the public, and to share a part of that popular esteem, that the *true and genuine Independents* had acquired, on account of the regularity of their lives and the sanctity of their manners. This is confirmed, among other testimonies, by the following passage of a letter from TOLAND to LE CLERC: *Au commencement tous les sectaires se disoient INDEPENDANS, parce que ces derniers étoient fort honorés du peuple, à cause de leur piété.* See LE CLERC's *Biblioth. Univers. et Histor.* tom. xxiii. p. ii. p. 506. As this title was of a very extensive signification and of great latitude, it might thus easily happen, that all the enormities of the various sects, who sheltered themselves under it, and several of whom were but of short duration, might unluckily be laid to the charge of the true *Independents*. But it must be particularly remarked in the *third place*, that the usurper CROMWELL preferred the *Independents* before all other religious communities. He looked with an equal eye of suspicion and fear upon the *Presbyterian synods* and the *Episcopal visitations*; every thing that looked like an extensive authority, whether it was of a civil or religious nature, excited uneasy apprehensions in the breast of the tyrant; but in the limited and simple form of ecclesiastical discipline, that was adopted by the *Independents*, he saw nothing that was adapted to alarm his fears. This circumstance was sufficient to render the *Independents* odious in the eyes of many, who would be naturally disposed to extend their abhorrence of CROMWELL to those who were the objects of his favour and protection.

[q] The *Independents* were undoubtedly so called from their maintaining that all Christian congregations, were so many *Independent* religious societies, that had a right to be governed by their own laws, without being subject to any further or foreign jurisdiction. ROBINSON, the founder of the sect, makes express use of this term in explaining his doctrine relating to ecclesiastical government. *Cætum quemlibet particularem* (says he, in his *Apologia*, cap. v. p. 22.) *esse totam, integram, et perfectam ecclesiam ex suis partibus constantem immediate et INDEPENDENTER (quoad alias ecclesias) sub ipso Christo.* It may possibly have been from this very passage that the title of *Independents* was originally derived. The disciples of ROBINSON did not reject it, nor indeed is there any thing shocking in the title, when it is understood in a manner conformable to the sentiments of those to whom it is applied. It was certainly utterly unknown in *England* before the year 1640; at least it is not once mentioned in the ecclesiastical canons and constitutions that were drawn up, during that year, in the synods or visitations held by the archbishops of *Canterbury*, *York*, and other prelates, in which canons all the various sects, that then subsisted in *England*, are particularly mentioned. See WILKINS's *Concilia Magnæ Britanniae et Hiberniae*, vol. iv. cap. v. p. 548. where are the *constitutions and canons ecclesiastical, treated upon by the*

favourable to their respective views, sentiments, and passions; this will engage us to think, that the *Independents*, at that time, may have been much more tumultuous and republican than the sect, which bears that denomination in our times. The reader, that would form just ideas of the matter of fact, must examine the relations given by the writers of both parties. See particularly CLARENDON's *History of his own Life*.—NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. iii. p. 547, &c.—HUME's *History of England*, vol. v. Edit. in Quarto.—BURNET's *History of his own Times*, vol. i. p. 46, 47.]

pally

pally consists; for their religious doctrines, except in some points of very little moment, are almost entirely the same with those that are adopted by the church of *Geneva*. The founder of this sect was JOHN ROBINSON, a man who had much of the solemn piety of the times, and was master of a congregation of *Brownists*, that had settled at *Leyden*. This well-meaning man, perceiving the defects that reigned in the discipline of BROWN, and in the spirit and temper of his followers, employed his zeal and diligence in correcting them, and in modelling anew the society in such a manner, as to render it less odious to its adversaries, and less liable to the just censure of those true Christians, who looked upon charity as the end of the commandment. The *Independents*, accordingly, were much more commendable than the *Brownists* in two respects. They surpassed them both in the moderation of their sentiments, and the order of their discipline. They did not, like BROWN, pour forth bitter and uncharitable invectives against the churches, that were governed by rules entirely different from theirs, nor pronounce them, on that account, unworthy of the Christian name. On the contrary, though they considered their own form of ecclesiastical government as of divine institution, and as originally introduced by the authority of the apostles, nay, by the apostles themselves, yet they had candour and charity enough to acknowledge, that true religion and solid piety might flourish in those communities, which were under the jurisdiction of bishops, or the government of synods and Presbyteries. They were also much more attentive, than the *Brownists*, in keeping on foot a regular ministry in their communities; for while the latter allowed promiscuously all ranks and orders of men to teach in public, and to perform the other pastoral functions, the *Independents* had, and still have, a certain number of ministers, chosen respectively by the congregations where they are fixed, nor is any person among them permitted to speak in public, before he has submitted to a proper examination of his capacity and talents, and been approved of by the heads of the congregation. This community, which was originally formed in *Holland*, in the year 1610, made, at first, but a very small progress in *England*; it worked its way slowly, and in a clandestine manner; and its members concealed their principles from public view to avoid the penal laws that had been enacted against *Non-conformists*. But during the reign of CHARLES I, when, amidst the shocks of civil and religious discord, the authority of the bishops and the cause of episcopacy began to decline, and more particularly about the year 1640, the *Independents* grew more

archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the rest of the bishops and clergy, in their several synods. An. MDCXL. It is true, that not long after this period, and more particularly from the year 1642, we find this denomination very frequently in the English *Annals*. The English *Independents* were so far from being displeased with it that they assumed it publicly in a piece, they published in their own defence at *London*, in the year 1644, under the following title: *Apologetical Narration of the Independents*. But when in process of time, a great variety of sects, as has been already observed, sheltered themselves under the cover of this extensive denomination, and even seditious subjects, that aimed at nothing less than the death of their sovereign and the destruction of the government, employed it as a mask to hide their deformity, then the true and genuine *Independents* renounced this title, and substituted another less odious in its place, calling themselves *Congregational Brethren*, and their religious assemblies *Congregational Churches*.

CENT. XVII. courageous, and came forth with an air of resolution and confidence to public view. After this period, their affairs took a prosperous turn; and, in a little time, they became so considerable both by their numbers and by the reputation they acquired, that they vied, in point of pre-eminence and credit, not only with the bishops, but also with the *Presbyterians*, though at this time in the very zenith of their power. This rapid progress of the *Independents* was, no doubt, owing to a variety of causes; among which justice obliges us to reckon the learning of their teachers, and the regularity and sanctity of their manners [r]. During the administration of CROMWELL, whose peculiar protection and patronage they enjoyed on more than one account, their credit arose to the greatest height, and their influence and reputation were universal; but after the restoration of CHARLES II, their cause declined, and they fell back gradually into their primitive obscurity. The sect, indeed, still subsisted, but in such a state of dejection and weakness, as engaged them, in the year 1691, under the reign of King WILLIAM, to enter into an association with the *Presbyterians* residing in and about London, under certain heads of agreement that tended to the maintenance of their respective institutions [s].

[r] NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 107. 293. vol. iii. p. 141. 145. 276. 303. 437. 549. See also a German work, entitled, *Englische Reformations-Histoire*, by ANTHONY WILLIAM BÖHM, p. 794.

[s] From this time they were called *United Brethren*. The heads of agreement that formed and cemented this union are to be found in the second volume of WHISTON'S *Memoirs of his Life and Writings*, and they consist in Nine Articles. The First relates to Churches and Church-members, in which the United Ministers, *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, declare, among other things, *That each particular church hath a right to chuse their own officers; and, being furnished with such as are duly qualified and ordained according to the Gospel rule, hath authority from Christ for exercising government and enjoying all the ordinances of worship within itself—That, in the administration of church-power, it belongs to the pastors and other elders of every particular church (if such there be) to rule and govern; and to the brotherhood to consent, according to the rule of the Gospel.* In this both *Presbyterians* and *Independents* depart from the primitive principles of their respective institutions. Article II, relates to the Ministry, which they grant to have been instituted by JESUS CHRIST, for the gathering, guiding, edifying, and governing of his church; in this article it is further observed, that ministers ought to be endued with competent learning, sound judgment, and solid piety; that none are to be ordained to the work of the ministry, but such as are chosen and called thereunto by a particular church; that, in such a weighty matter, it is ordinarily requisite that every such church consult and advise with the pastors of neighbouring congregations; and that after such advice the person thus consulted about, being chosen by the brotherhood of that particular church, be duly ordained and set apart to his office over them. Article III, relates to Censures, and prescribes first the admonishing, and, if this prove ineffectual, the excommunication, of offending and scandalous members, to be performed by the pastors, with the consent of the brethren. Article IV, concerning the Communion of Churches, lays it down as a principle, that there is no subordination between particular churches; that they are all equal, and consequently independent; that the pastors, however, of these churches ought to have frequent meetings together, that, by mutual advice, support, encouragement, and brotherly intercourse, they strengthen the hearts and hands of each other in the ways of the Lord. In Article V, which relates to Deacons and Ruling Elders, the United Brethren acknowledge, that the office of a deacon is of divine appointment, and that it belongs to their office to receive, lay out, and distribute the stock of the church to its proper uses; and as there are different sentiments about the office of Ruling Elders, who labour not in word and doctrine, they agree, that this difference make no breach among them. In Article VI, concerning Occasional Meetings of Ministers, &c. the brethren agree, that it is needful, in weighty and difficult cases, that the ministers of several churches meet together, in order to be consulted and advised with about such matters; and that particular churches

XXII. While

XXII. While OLIVER CROMWELL held the reins of government in CENT. XVII. *Great-Britain*, all sects, even those that dishonoured true religion in the most shocking manner by their fanaticism or their ignorance, enjoyed a full and unbounded liberty of professing publicly their respective doctrines. The *Episcopalians* alone were excepted from this toleration, and received the most severe and iniquitous treatment. The bishops were deprived of their dignities and revenues, and felt the heavy hand of oppression in a particular manner. But though the toleration extended to all other sects and religious communities, yet the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* were treated with peculiar marks of distinction and favour. CROMWELL, though attached to no one particular sect, gave the latter extraordinary proofs of his good will, and augmented their credit and authority, as this seemed the easiest and least exasperating method of setting bounds to the ambition of the *Presbyterians*, who aimed at a very high degree of ecclesiastical power [t]. It was during this period of religious anarchy, that the *Fifth-monarchy-men* arose, a set of wrong-headed and turbulent enthusiasts, who expected CHRIST'S sudden appearances upon earth to establish a new kingdom; and, acting in consequence of this illusion, aimed at the subversion of all human government, and were for turning all things into the most deplorable confusion [u]. It was at this time also, that the *Quakers*, of whom we propose to give a more particular account [w], and the hot-headed *Anabaptists* [x] propagated, without restraint, their visionary doctrines. It must

The state of the church of England under Cromwell.

ought to have a reverential regard to their judgment so given, and not dissent therefrom without apparent grounds from the word of God. Article VII, which relates to the *Demeanour of the Brethren towards the Civil Magistrate*, prescribes obedience to, and prayers for, God's protection and blessing upon their rulers. In Article VIII, which relates to a *Confession of Faith*, the brethren esteem it sufficient, that a church acknowledge the Scriptures to be the word of God, the perfect and only rule of faith and practice, and *own either the doctrinal part of the articles of the church of England, or the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, drawn up by the Presbyterians, or the Confession of the Congregational Brethren (i. e. the Independents) to be agreeable to the said rule.* Article IX, which concerns *the duty and deportment of the Brethren towards those that are not in communion with them*, inculcates charity and moderation. It appears from these articles, that the *Independents* were led, by a kind of necessity, to adopt, in many things, the sentiments of the *Presbyterians*, and to depart thus far from the original principles of their sect.

[(t) A little after CROMWELL'S elevation it was resolved by the parliament, at the conclusion of a debate concerning public worship and church government, that the *Presbyterian* government should be the established government. The *Independents* were not, as yet, agreed upon any standard of faith and discipline; and it was only a little before CROMWELL'S death that they held a synod, by his permission, in order to publish to the world an *uniform* account of their doctrine and principles.]

[u] See BURNET'S *History of his own Times*, tom. i. p. 67.

[w] See below, *The History of the Quakers*.

[(x) We are not to imagine by the term hot-headed (*furiosi*), that the *Anabaptists* resembled the furious fanatics of that name, that formerly excited such dreadful tumults in *Germany*, and more especially at *Munster*. This was, by no means, the case; the English *Anabaptists* differed from their Protestant brethren about the *subject* and *mode* of Baptism alone: Confining the former to *grown Christians*, and the latter to *immersion* or dipping. They were divided into *Generals* and *Particulars*, from their different sentiments upon the Arminian controversy. The latter, who were so called from their belief of the doctrines of *Particular Election*, *Redemption*, &c. were strict Calvinists, who separated from the *Independent* congregation at *Leyden*, in the year 1638. Their confession was composed with a remarkable spirit of modesty and charity. Their preachers were likewise

CENT. XVII.

The English
Antinomians.

likewise be observed, that the *Deists*, headed by SIDNEY, NEVILLE, MARTIN, and HARRINGTON, appeared with impunity, and promoted a kind of religion, which consisted in a few plain precepts drawn from the dictates of natural reason [y].

XXIII. Among the various religious factions, that sprung up in England during this period of confusion and anarchy, we may reckon a certain sect of *Presbyterians*, who were called by their adversaries *Antinomians*, or enemies of the law, and still subsist even in our times. The *Antinomians* are a more rigid kind of Calvinists, who pervert CALVIN's doctrine of absolute decrees to the worst purposes, by drawing from it conclusions highly detrimental to the interests of true religion and virtue. Such is the judgment that the other Presbyterian communities form of this perverse and extravagant sect [z]. Several of the *Antinomians* (for they are not all precisely of the same mind) look upon it as unnecessary for Christian ministers to exhort their flock to a virtuous practice and a pious obedience to the divine law, "Since they, whom God has *erected* to salvation, by an eternal and immutable decree, will, by the *irresistible* impulse of divine grace, be led to the practice of piety and virtue; while those, who are doomed by a divine decree to eternal punishments, will never be engaged, by any exhortations or admonitions, how affecting soever they may be, to a virtuous course, nor have they it in their power to obey the divine law when the succours of divine grace are withheld from them." From these principles they concluded, that the ministers of the Gospel discharged sufficiently their pastoral functions, when they inculcated the necessity of *faith in Christ*, and proclaimed the blessings of the new covenant to their people. Another, and a still more hideous form of *Antinomianism*, is that, which is exhibited in the opinions of other doctors of that sect [a], who maintain, "That as the *elect* cannot fall from grace, nor forfeit the divine favour; so it follows, that the wicked actions they commit, and the violations of the divine law with which they are chargeable, are not *really sinful*, nor are to be considered as instances of their departing from the law of God; and that, consequently, they have no occasion either to confess their sins, or to break them off by repentance. Thus adultery, for example, in one of the *elect*, though it appear *sinful* in the sight of men, and be considered universally as an enormous violation of the divine law, yet is not a *sin* in the sight of God, because it is one of the essential and distinctive cha-

generally illiterate, and were eager in making proselytes of all that would submit to their *immersion*, without a due regard to their religious principles or their moral characters. The writers of these times represent them as tainted with a kind of enthusiastic fury against all that opposed them. There were, nevertheless, among them some learned and pious persons, who disapproved highly of all violent and uncharitable proceedings.]

[y] NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. iv. p. 87.

[z] See TOLAND's letter to LE CLERC, in the periodical work of the latter, entitled, *Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique*, tom. xxiii. p. 505.—As also HORNBECK, *Summa Controversiarum*, p. 800. 812.

[(a) This second *Antinomian* hypothesis has certainly a still more odious aspect than the first; and it is therefore surprizing, that our author should use, in the original, these terms: *Hi tantum statuunt, Electos, &c.*]

“ racters

“racters of the elect, that *they cannot do any thing which is either displeasing to God, or prohibited by the law* [b].” CENT. XVII.

XXIV. The public calamities, that flowed from these vehement and uncharitable disputes about religion, afflicted all wise and good men, and engaged several, who were not less eminent for their piety than for their moderation and wisdom, to seek after some method of uniting such of the contending parties, as were capable of listening to the dictates of charity and reason, or, at least, of calming their animosities, and persuading them to mutual forbearance. These pacific doctors offered themselves, as mediators between the more violent *Episcopalians*, on the one hand, and the more rigid *Presbyterians* and *Independents* on the other; and hoped that when their differences were accommodated the lesser factions would fall of themselves. The contests, that reigned between the former, turned partly on the forms of church government and public worship, and partly on certain religious tenets, more especially those that were debated between the Arminians and Calvinists. To lessen the breach that kept these two great communities at such a distance from each other, the arbitrators, already mentioned, endeavoured to draw them out of their narrow enclosures, to render their charity more extensive, and widen the paths of salvation, which bigotry and party-rage had been labouring to render inaccessible to many good Christians. This noble and truly evangelical method of proceeding procured to its authors the denomination of *Latitudinarians* [c]. Their views, indeed, were generous and extensive. They were zealously attached to the forms of ecclesiastical government and worship, that were established in the church of *England*, and they recommended episcopacy with all the strength and power of their eloquence; but they did not go so far, as to look upon it as of *divine institution*, or as absolutely and indispensably necessary to the constitution of a Christian church; and hence they maintained, that those, who followed other forms of government and worship, were not, on that account, to be excluded from their communion, or to forfeit the title of Brethren. As to the doctrinal part of religion, they took the system of the famous *EPISCOPIUS* for their model; and, like him, reduced the fundamental doctrines of Christianity (*i. e.* those doctrines, the belief of which is necessary to salvation) to a few points. By this manner of proceeding, they shewed that neither the *Episcopalians*, who, generally speaking, embraced the sentiments of the Arminians, nor the *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, who, as generally, adopted the doctrine of *CALVIN*, had any reason to oppose each other with such animosity and bitterness, since the subjects of their debates were matters of an indifferent nature with respect to salvation, and might be variously explained and understood without any prejudice to their eternal

[b] There is an account of the other tenets of the *Antinomians*, and of the modern disputes that were occasioned by the publication of the Posthumous Works of *CRISP*, a flaming doctor of that extravagant and pernicious sect, given by *PIERRE FRANCOIS LE COURAYER*, in his *Examen des defects Theologiques*, tom. ii. p. 198. *BAXTER* and *TILLOTSON* distinguished themselves by their zeal against the *Antinomians*; and they were also compleatly refuted by *Dr. WILLIAMS*, in his famous book, entitled, *Gospel truth stated and vindicated*, 8°.

[c] See *BURNET'S History of his own Times*, vol. i. book ii. p. 188.

CENT. XVII. interests. The chief leaders of these Latitudinarians, were HALES and CHILLINGWORTH, whose names are still pronounced in *England* with that veneration, that is due to distinguished wisdom and rational piety [d]. The respectable names of MORE, CUDWORTH, GALE, WHITCHCOT, and TILLOTSON, add a high degree of lustre to this eminent list. The undertaking of these great men was, indeed, bold and perilous; and it drew upon them much opposition and many bitter reproaches. They received, as the first fruits of their charitable zeal, the odious appellations of Atheists, Deists, and Socinians, both from the Roman-catholics and the more rigid of the contending Protestant parties; but, upon the restoration of King CHARLES II, they were raised to the first dignities of the church, and were deservedly held in universal esteem. It is also well known, that, even at this present time, the church of *England* is chiefly governed by *Latitudinarians* of this kind; though there be among both bishops and clergy, from time to time, ecclesiastics, who breathe the narrow and despotic spirit of LAUD, and who, in the language of faction, are called *High-churchmen*, or *Church-tories* [e].

The state of the church of *England* under Charles II, and his successors.

XXV. No sooner was CHARLES II re-established on the throne of his ancestors, than the ancient forms of ecclesiastical government and public worship were restored with him; and the bishops re-instated in their dignities and honours. The *Non-conformists* hoped, that *they* should be allowed to share some part of the honours and revenues of the church; but their expectations were totally disappointed, and the face of affairs changed very suddenly with respect to them. For CHARLES subjected to the government of bishops the churches of *Scotland* and *Ireland*, the former of which was peculiarly attached to the ecclesiastical discipline and polity of *Geneva*; and, in the year 1662, a public law was enacted, by which all who refused to observe the rites, and subscribe the doctrines, of the church of *England*, were entirely excluded from its communion [f]. From this period, until

[d] The life of the ingenious and worthy Mr. HALES, was composed in English by M. DES MAIZEAU, and published in 8°. at *London*, in the year 1719; it was considerably augmented in the Latin translation of it, which I prefixed to the account of the synod of *Dort*, drawn from the letters of that great man, and published at *Hamburg* in 1724. A life of Mr. HALES, written in French, is to be found in the first volume of the French translation of CHILLINGWORTH's *Religion of Protestants*, &c.—The life of CHILLINGWORTH also was drawn up by DES MAIZEAUX in English, and a French translation of it appeared, in the year 1730, at the head of the excellent book now mentioned, which was translated into that language, and published at *Amsterdam*, in three volumes, 8°. in the year 1730. Those, who are desirous of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the doctrines, government, laws, and present state of the church of *England*, will do well to read the history of these two men; and more especially to peruse CHILLINGWORTH's admirable book already mentioned, I mean, *The Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation*.

[e] See RAPIN's *Dissertation on the Whigs and Tories*.

[f] This was the famous *Act of Uniformity*, in consequence of which the validity of Presbyterian ordination was renounced; the ministrations of the foreign churches disowned; the terms of conformity rendered more difficult and raised higher than before the civil wars; and by which (contrary to the manner of proceeding in the times of ELIZABETH and CROMWELL, who, both, reserved for the subsistence of each ejected clergyman a fifth part of his benefice) no provision was made for those, who should be deprived of their livings. See WILKINS's *Concilia Magnæ Britan-*
the

the reign of King WILLIAM III, the *Non-conformists* were in a precarious and changing situation, sometimes involved in calamity and trouble, at others enjoying some intervals of tranquillity and certain gleams of hope, according to the varying spirit of the court and ministry, but never entirely free from perplexities and fears [g]. But, in the year 1689, their affairs took a favourable turn, when a bill for the *toleration* of all Protestant dissenters from the church of *England*, except the Socinians, passed in parliament almost without opposition, and delivered them from the penal laws to which they had been subjected by the *Act of Uniformity*, and other acts passed under the house of STUART [h]. Nor did the Protestant dissenters in *England* enjoy alone the benefits of this act; for it extended also to the Scots church, which was permitted thereby to follow the ecclesiastical discipline of *Geneva*, and was delivered from the jurisdiction of bishops and from the forms of worship that were annexed to episcopacy. It is from this period, that the *Non-conformists* date the liberty and tranquillity they have long been blessed with, and still enjoy; but it is also observable, that it is to the transactions that were carried on during this period, in favour of religious liberty, that we must chiefly impute the multitude of religious sects and factions, that start up from time to time in that free and happy island, and involve its inhabitants in the perplexities of religious division and controversy [i].

XXVI. In the reign of King WILLIAM, and in the year 1689, the divisions among the friends of episcopacy ran high, and terminated in that famous schism in the church of *England*, which has never hitherto been entirely healed. SANCROFT, archbishop of *Canterbury*, and eight of the other bishops, all of whom were eminently distinguished both by their learning and their virtue, looked upon it as unlawful to take the oaths of allegiance to the new king, from a mistaken notion that JAMES II, though banished from his dominions, remained, nevertheless, their rightful sovereign. As these scruples were deeply rooted, and no arguments nor exhortations could engage these prelates to acknowledge the title of WILLIAM III to the crown of *Great-Britain*, they were deprived of their ecclesiastical dignities, and their sees were filled by other men of eminent merit. The deposed bishops and clergy formed a new episcopal church, which differed, in certain points of doctrine and certain circumstances of public worship, from the established church of *England*. This new religious community were denominated

The High-church
and Non-jurors.

nia et Hibernia, tom. iv. p. 573.—BURNET'S *History of his own Times*, vol. ii. p. 190, &c.—NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*, tom. iv. p. 358.]

[g] See the whole fourth volume of NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*.

[h] This was called the *Toleration-Act*, and it may be seen at length in the *Appendix*, subjoined to the fourth volume of NEAL'S *History of the Puritans*. [It is entitled, *An Act for exempting their Majesties Protestant Subjects, dissenting from the Church of England, from the Penalties of certain Laws*. In this Bill the *Corporation* and *Test Acts* are omitted, and consequently still remain in force. The Socinians are also excepted; but provision is made for Quakers, upon their making a solemn declaration, instead of taking the oaths to the government. This Act excuses Protestant Dissenters from the penalties of the laws therein mentioned, provided they take the oaths to the government, and subscribe the *Doctrinal Articles* of the church of *England*.]

[i] BURNET'S *History of his own Times*, vol. ii. p. 23.

CENT. XVII. *Non-jurors*, on account of their refusing to take the oath of allegiance, and were also called the *High-church*, on account of the high notions they entertained of the dignity and power of the church, and the extent they gave to its prerogatives and jurisdiction. Those, on the other hand, who disapproved of this schism, who distinguished themselves by their charity and moderation towards dissenters, and were less ardent in extending the limits of ecclesiastical authority, were denominated *Low-churchmen* [k]. The bishops who were deprived of their ecclesiastical dignities, and those who embarked in their cause, maintained openly, that the church was independent on the jurisdiction of king and parliament, subject to the authority of God alone, and empowered to govern itself by its own laws; that, of consequence, the sentence, pronounced against these prelates by the great council of the nation, was destitute both of justice and validity; and that it was only by the decree of an ecclesiastical council that a bishop could be deposed. This high notion of the authority and prerogatives of the church was maintained and propagated, with peculiar zeal, by the famous HENRY DODWELL, who led the way in this important cause, and who, by his example and abilities, formed a considerable number of champions for its defence; hence arose a very nice and intricate controversy concerning the nature, privileges, and authority of the church, which has not yet been brought to a satisfactory conclusion [l].

High-church
principles.

XXVII. The *Non-jurors* or *High-churchmen*, who boast, with peculiar ostentation, of their orthodoxy, and treat the *Low-church* as unsound and schismatical, differ in several things from the members of the episcopal church, in its present establishment; but they are more particularly distinguished by the following principles: 1. *That it is never lawful for the people, under any provocation or pretext whatever, to resist their sovereign.* This is called in *England* *passive obedience*, and is a doctrine warmly opposed by many, who think it both lawful and necessary, in certain circumstances, and in cases of an urgent and momentous nature, to resist the prince for the happiness of the people. They maintain further, 2. *That the hereditary succession to the throne is of divine institution, and, therefore, can never be interrupted, suspended, or annulled on any pretext.* 3. *That the church is subject to the jurisdiction, not of the civil magistrate, but of God alone, particularly in matters of a religious nature.* 4. *That, consequently, SANCROFT and the other bishops, deposed by King WILLIAM III, remained, notwithstanding their deposition, TRUE BISHOPS to the day of their death; and that those who were substituted in their place were the unjust possessors of other men's property.* 5. *That these unjust possessors of ecclesiastical dignities were rebels against the state, as well as schismatics*

[k] The denomination of *High-church* is given certainly, with great propriety, to the *Non-jurors*, who have very proud notions of church-power; but it is commonly used in a more extensive signification, and is applied to all those, who, though far from being *Non-jurors*, or otherwise disaffected to the present happy establishment, yet form pompous and ambitious conceptions of the authority and jurisdiction of the church, and would raise it to an absolute independence on all human power. Many such are to be found even among those, who go under the general denomination of the *Low-church* party.

[l] See the *Bangorian Controversy*.]

in the church; and that all, therefore, who held communion with them were also chargeable with rebellion and schism. 6. That this schism, which rents the church in pieces, is a most heinous sin, whose punishment must fall heavy upon all those, who do not return sincerely to the true church, from which they have departed [m].

XXVIII. It will now be proper to change the scene, and to consider a little the state of the Reformed church in *Holland*. The Dutch Calvinists thought themselves happy, after the defeat of the Arminians; and were flattering themselves with the agreeable prospect of enjoying long, in tranquillity and repose, the fruits of their victory, when new scenes of tumult arose from another quarter. Scarcely had they triumphed over the enemies of absolute predestination, when, by an ill hap, they became the prey of intestine disputes, and were divided among themselves in such a deplorable manner, that, during the whole of this century, the United Provinces were a scene of contention, animosity, and strife. It is not necessary to mention all the subjects of these religious quarrels; nor indeed would this be an easy task. We shall therefore pass over in silence the debates of certain divines, who disputed about some particular, though not very momentous, points of doctrine and discipline, such as those of the famous VOET and the learned DES MARETS; as also the disputes of SALMASIUS, BOXHORN, VOET, and others, concerning usury, ornaments in dress, stage-plays, and other minute points of morality; and the contests of APOLLONIUS, TRIGLAND, and VEDELIUS, concerning the power of the magistrate in matters of religion and ecclesiastical discipline, which produced such a flaming division between FREDERIC SPANHEIM and JOHN VANDER WAYEN. These, and other debates of like nature and importance, rather discover the sentiments of certain learned men, concerning some particular points of religion and morality, than exhibit a view of the true internal state of the Belgic church. The knowledge of this must be derived from those controversies alone in which the whole church, or at least the greatest part of its doctors, have been directly concerned.

Theological contests among the Dutch.

XXIX. Such were the controversies occasioned in *Holland* by the philosophy of DES CARTES, and the theological novelties of COCCEIUS. Hence arose the two powerful and numerous factions, distinguished by the denominations of *Cocceians* and *Voetians*, which still subsist, though their debates are now less violent, and their champions somewhat more moderate, than they were in former times. The Cocceian theology and the Cartesian philosophy have, indeed, no common features, nor any thing, in their respective tenets and principles, that was in the least adapted to form a connexion between them; and, of consequence, the debates they excited, and the factions they produced, had no natural relation to or dependence on each other. It nevertheless so happened, that the respective votaries of these very different sciences formed themselves into one sect; so far at least,

The Cartesian and Cocceian controversies.

[m] See WHISTON'S *Memoirs of his Life and Writings*, vol. i. p. 30.—HICKES'S *Memoirs of the Life of JOHN KETTLEWELL*, printed at London in 1718.—*Nouveau Diction. Histor. et Critiq.* at the article COLLIER.—PH. MASSON, *Histor. Critique de la Repub. des Lettres*, tom. xiii. p. 298.

that

CENT. XVII. that those who chose COCCEIUS for their guide in theology took DES CARTES for their master in philosophy [n]. This will appear less surprising when we consider, that the very same persons, who opposed the progress of *Cartesianism* in *Holland*, were the warm adversaries of the COCCEIAN theology; for this opposition equally levelled at these two great men, and their respective systems laid the *Cartesians* and *Cocceians* under a kind of necessity of uniting their force in order to defend their cause, in a more effectual manner, against the formidable attacks of their numerous adversaries. The *Voetians* were so called from GISBERT VOET, a learned and eminent professor of divinity in the university of *Utrecht*, who first sounded the alarm of this theologico-philosophical war, and led on, with zeal, the polemic legions against those who followed the standard of DES CARTES and COCCEIUS.

Cartesian controversy.

XXX. The Cartesian philosophy, at its first appearance, attracted the attention and esteem of many, and seemed more conformable to truth and nature, as well as more elegant and pleasing in its aspect, than the intricate labyrinths of Peripatetic wisdom. It was considered in this light in *Holland*; it however met there with a formidable adversary, in the year 1639, in the famous VOET, who taught theology at *Utrecht* with the greatest reputation, and gave plain intimations of his looking upon Cartesianism as a system of impiety. VOET was a man of uncommon application and immense learning; he had made an extraordinary progress in all the various branches of erudition and philology; but he was not endowed with a large portion of that philosophical spirit, that judges with acuteness and precision of natural science and abstract truths. While DES CARTES resided at *Utrecht*, VOET found fault with many things in his philosophy; but what induced him to cast upon it the aspersions of impiety, was its being introduced by the following principles: "That the person, who aspires after the character of a true philosopher, must begin by doubting of all things, even of the existence of a supreme Being—that the nature or *essence* of spirit, and even of God himself, consists in *thought*—that space has no real existence, is no more than the creature of fancy, and that, consequently, *matter* is without bounds."

DES CARTES defended his principles, with his usual acuteness, against the professor of *Utrecht*; his disciples and followers thought themselves obliged, on this occasion, to assist their master; and thus war was formally declared. On the other hand, VOET was not only seconded by those Belgic divines that were the most eminent, at this time, for the extent of their learning and the soundness of their theology, such as RIVET, DES MARETS, and MASTRICHT, but also was followed and applauded by the greatest part of the Dutch clergy [o]. While the flame of controversy burned with sufficient ardour, it was considerably augmented by the proceedings of certain

[n] See FRID. SPANHEMII *Epistola de gravissimis in Belgio dissidiis*, tom. ii. opp. p. 973.

[o] See BAILLET'S *Vie de M. DES CARTES*, tom. ii. chap. v. p. 33.—DANIEL, *Voyage du Monde de DES CARTES*, tom. i. de ses *Ouvrages*, p. 84.

doctors, who applied the principles and tenets of DES CARTES to the illustration of theological truth. Hence, in the year 1656, an alarm was raised in the Dutch churches and schools of learning, and a resolution was taken in several of their ecclesiastical assemblies (commonly called *Classes*), to make head against Cartesianism, and not to permit that *imperious* philosophy to make such encroachments upon the domain of theology. The States of *Holland* not only approved of this resolution, but also gave it new force and efficacy by a public edict, issued out the very same year, by which both the professors of philosophy and theology were forbidden either to explain the writings of DES CARTES to the youth under their care, or to illustrate the doctrines of the Gospel by the principles of philosophy. It was further resolved, in an assembly of the clergy, held at *Delft*, the year following, that no candidate for holy orders should be received into the ministry before he made a solemn declaration, that he would neither promote the Cartesian philosophy, nor disfigure the divine simplicity of religion, by loading it with foreign ornaments. Laws of a like tenor were afterwards passed in the United Provinces and in other countries [p]. But, as there is in human nature a strange propensity to struggle against authority, and to pursue with a peculiar degree of ardour things that are forbidden, so it happened, that all these edicts proved insufficient to stop the progress of Cartesianism, which, at length, obtained a solid and permanent footing in the seminaries of learning, and was applied, both in the academies and pulpits, and sometimes indeed very preposterously, to explain the truths and precepts of Christianity. Hence it was, that the United Provinces were divided into the two great factions already mentioned; and that the whole remainder of this century was spent amidst their contentions and debates.

XXXI. JOHN COCCEIUS, a native of *Bremen*, and professor of divinity in the university of *Leyden*, might have certainly passed for a great man, had his vast erudition, his exuberant fancy, his ardent piety, and his uncommon application to the study of the Scriptures, been under the direction of a sound and solid judgment. This singular man introduced into theology a multitude of new tenets and strange notions, which had never before entered into the brain of any other mortal, or at least had never been heard of before his time. For, in the first place, as has been already hinted, his manner of explaining the holy Scriptures was totally different from that of CALVIN and his followers. Departing entirely from the admirable simplicity that reigns in the commentaries of that great man, COCCEIUS represented the whole history of the Old Testament as a *mirror*, that held forth an accurate view of the transactions and events that were to happen in the church under the dispensation of the New Testament, and unto the end of the world. He even went so far, as to maintain, that the miracles, actions, and sufferings of CHRIST and of his apostles, during the course of their

The sentiments
of Cocceius con-
cerning the holy
Scriptures.

[p] FRID. SPANHEIM, *De novissimis in Belgio dissidiis*, tom. ii. opp. p. 959.—The reader may also consult the historians of this century, such as ARNOLD, WEISMANN, JAEGER, CAROLI, and also WALCHIUS's *Histor. Controvers. Germanic.* tom. iii.

ministry,

CENT. XVII. ministry, were *types* and images of future events. He affirmed, that by far the greatest part of the ancient prophecies foretold CHRIST's ministry and mediation, and the rise, progress, and revolutions of the church, not only under the figure of certain persons and *transactions*, but in a literal manner and by the very sense of the *words* used in these predictions. And he compleated the extravagance of this chimerical system by turning, with wonderful art and dexterity, into holy riddles and typical predictions, even those passages of the Old Testament, that seemed designed for no other purpose than to celebrate the praises of the Deity, or to convey some religious truth, or to inculcate some rule of practice. In order to give an air of solidity and plausibility to these odd notions, he first laid it down, as a fundamental rule of interpretation, "That the *words* and *phrases* of Scripture are to be understood *in every sense* of which they are *susceptible*; or, in other words, "that they signify *in effect* every thing, that they *can* possibly signify;" a rule this, which, when followed by a man who had more imagination than judgment, could not fail to produce very extraordinary comments on the sacred writings. After having laid down this singular rule of interpretation, he divided the whole history of the church into *seven periods*, conformable to the seven *trumpets* and *seals* mentioned in the *Revelations*.

Concerning the doctrinal part of theology.

XXXII. One of the great designs formed by COCCÆUS was that of separating theology from philosophy, and of confining the Christian doctors, in their explications of the former, to the words and phrases of the holy Scriptures. Hence it was, that, finding in the language of the sacred writers the Gospel dispensation represented under the image of a *Covenant* made between God and man, he looked upon the use of this image as admirably adapted to exhibit a compleat and well-connected system of religious truth. But while he was labouring this point, and endeavouring to accommodate the circumstances and characters of human contracts to the dispensations of divine wisdom, which they represent in such an inaccurate and imperfect manner, he fell imprudently into some erroneous notions. Such was his opinion concerning the covenant made between God and the Jewish nation by the ministry and mediation of MOSES, which "he affirmed to be of the same nature with "the New Covenant obtained by the mediation of JESUS CHRIST." In consequence of this general principle he maintained, "That the *Ten Commandments* were promulgated by MOSES, not as a *rule of obedience*, but as a "representation of the covenant of grace—that when the Jews had provoked "the Deity by their various transgressions, particularly by the worship of "the golden calf, the severe and servile yoke of the ceremonial law was "added to the *decalogue* as a punishment inflicted on them by the supreme "Being in his righteous displeasure—that this yoke, which was painful in "itself, became doubly so on account of its *typical* signification, since it "admonished the Israelites, from day to day, of the imperfection and uncertainty of their state, filled them with anxiety, and was a standing and "perpetual proof that they had merited the displeasure of God, and could

" not

“not expect, before the coming of the MESSIAH, the entire remission of
 “their transgressions and iniquities—that, indeed, good men, even under
 “the Mosaic dispensation, were immediately after death made partakers of
 “everlasting happiness and glory; but that they were, nevertheless, during
 “the whole course of their lives, far removed from that firm hope and
 “assurance of salvation, which rejoices the faithful under the dispensation of
 “the Gospel—and that their hopeless anxiety flowed naturally from this
 “consideration, that their sins, though they remained unpunished, were not
 “pardoned, because CHRIST had not, as yet, offered himself up a sacrifice
 “to the father to make an entire atonement for them.” These are the
 principal lines that distinguish the *Cocceian* from other systems of theology;
 it is attended, indeed, with other peculiarities; but we shall pass them over
 in silence as of little moment and unworthy of notice. These notions were
 warmly opposed by the same persons that declared war against the Cartesian
 philosophy; and the contest was carried on for many years with various
 success. But, in the issue, the doctrines of COCCÆIUS, like those of DES
 CARTES, stood their ground; and neither the dexterity nor vehemence of
 his adversaries could exclude his disciples from the public seminaries of
 learning, or hinder them from propagating with surprizing success and
 rapidity the tenets of their master in *Germany* and *Switzerland* [q].

XXXIII. The other controversies, that divided the Belgic church during
 this century, all arose from the immoderate propensity that certain doctors
 discovered towards an alliance between the Cartesian philosophy and their
 theological system. This will appear with the utmost evidence from the
 debates excited by ROELL and BECKER, which surpassed all the others both
 by the importance of their subjects, and by the noise they made in the
 world. About the year 1686, certain Cartesian doctors of divinity, headed
 by the ingenious HERMEN ALEXANDER ROELL, professor of theology in the
 university of *Franecker*, seemed to attribute to the dictates of reason a more
 extensive authority in religious matters, than they had hitherto been pos-
 sessed of. The controversy, occasioned by this innovation, was reducible to
 the two following questions. “1. Whether the divine origin and authority
 “of the holy Scriptures can be demonstrated by reason alone, or whether
 “an inward testimony of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of Christians be
 “necessary in order to the firm belief of this fundamental point? 2. Whe-
 “ther the sacred writings propose to us, as an object of faith, any thing
 “that is repugnant to the dictates of right reason?” These questions were
 answered, the former in the affirmative and the latter in the negative, not
 only by ROELL, but also by VANDER WAYEN, WESSELIUS, DUKER,
 RUARDUS AB ANDALA, and other doctors, who were opposed in this by
 ULRIC NUBER, an eminent lawyer, GERARD DE VRIES, and others of in-
 ferior note [r]. The flame, excited by this controversy, spread itself far and

The controversy
 set on foot by
 Roell, concern-
 ing the use of
 reason in reli-
 gion.

[q] See BAILLET'S *Vie de M. DES CARTES*, tom. ii. p. 33.—DANIEL, *Voyage du Monde de
 DES CARTES*.—VAL. ALBERTI *Διπλῶν καὶ πᾶσι Cartesianiſmus et Cocceianiſmus deſcripti et reſutati*.
Lips. 1678, in 4^{to}.

[r] See LE CLERC, *Biblioth. Univerſ. et Hiſtorique*, tom. vi. p. 368.

CENT. XVII. wide through the United Provinces; and its progress was increasing from day to day, when the states of *Friesland* prudently interposed to restore the peace of the church, by imposing silence on the contending parties. Those, whose curiosity may engage them to examine with attention and accuracy the points debated in this controversy, will find that a very considerable part of it was merely a dispute about words; and that the real difference of sentiment that there was between these learned disputants might have been easily accommodated by proper explications on both sides.

Sentiments of Roell, concerning the generation of the son of God.

XXXIV. Not long after this controversy had been hushed, ROELL alarmed the orthodoxy of his colleagues, and more particularly of the learned VITRINGA, by some other new tenets that rendered the soundness of his religious principles extremely doubtful, not only in their opinion, but also in the judgment of many Dutch divines [s]. For he maintained, "That the account we have of the generation of the son in the sacred writings, is not to be understood in a literal sense, or as a real generation of a natural kind;" he also affirmed, "That the afflictions and death of the righteous are as truly the penal effects of original sin, as the afflictions and death of the wicked and impenitent;" and he entertained notions concerning the *divine decrees*, *original sin*, the *satisfaction* of CHRIST, and other points of less moment, which differed in reality, or by the manner of expressing them seemed to differ, greatly from the doctrines received and established in the Dutch church [t]. The magistrates of *Friesland* used all the precautions that prudence could suggest, to prevent these controversies from being propagated in their province, and enacted several laws for this purpose, all tending towards peace and silence. This conduct, however, was not imitated by the other provinces, where ROELL and his disciples were condemned both in private and in public as heretics and corrupters of divine truth. Nor did the death of this eminent man extinguish the animosity and resentment of his adversaries; for his disciples are still treated with severity; and, notwithstanding the solemn protestations they have given of the soundness and purity of their religious sentiments, labour under the imputation of many concealed errors.

The contest occasioned by the peculiar sentiments of Becker.

XXXV. The controversy set on foot by the ingenious BALTHAZAR BECKER, minister at *Amsterdam*, must not be omitted here. This learned ecclesiastic took occasion, from the Cartesian definition of *spirit*, of the truth and precision of which he was intimately persuaded, to deny boldly all the accounts we have in the holy Scriptures of the seduction, influence, and operations of the devil and his infernal emissaries; as also all that has been said in favour of the existence of ghosts, spectres, sorcerers, and magicians.

[s] For an account of ROELL, see the *Bibliotheca Bremens. Theologico-Philolog.* tom. ii. p. vi. p. 707.—CASP. BURMANNI *Trajectum Eruditum*, p. 306.

[t] Those, who are desirous of the most accurate account of the errors of ROELL, will find them enumerated in a public piece, composed by the *Faculty of Theology* at *Leyden*, in order to confirm the sentence of condemnation that had been pronounced against them by the Dutch synods; this piece is entitled, *Judicium Ecclesiasticum, quo opiniones quædam Cl. H. A. ROELLII Synodice damnatæ sunt, laudatum a Professoribus Theologiæ in Academia Lugduno-Batava.* Lugd. Batav. 1713, in 4^{to}.

The long and laboured work he published, in the year 1691, upon this interesting subject is still extant. In this singular production, which bears the title of *The World Bewitched*, he modifies and perverts with the greatest ingenuity, but also with equal temerity and presumption, the accounts given, by the sacred writers, of the power of Satan and wicked angels, and of persons possessed by evil spirits; he affirms, moreover, that the unhappy and malignant Being, who is called in Scripture *Satan*, or the *Devil*, is chained down, with his infernal ministers, in hell; so that he can never come forth from this eternal prison, to terrify mortals, or to seduce the righteous from the paths of virtue. According to the Cartesian definition above-mentioned, the *essence of spirit* consists in *thought*; and from this definition, BECKER drew his doctrine, since none of that influence, or of those operations that are attributed to evil spirits, can be effected by mere *thinking* [u]. Rather, therefore, than call into question the accuracy or authority of DES CARTES, BECKER thought proper to force the narrations and doctrines of Scripture into a conformity with the principles and definitions of this philosopher. These errors, nevertheless, excited great tumults and divisions, not only in all the United Provinces, but also in some parts of *Germany*, where several doctors of the Lutheran church were alarmed at its progress, and arose to oppose it [w]. Their inventor and promoter, though refuted victoriously by a multitude of adversaries, and publicly deposed from his pastoral charge, died, in the year 1718, in the full persuasion of the truth of those opinions, that had drawn upon him so much opposition, and professed, with his last breath, his sincere adherence to every thing he had written on that subject. Nor can it be said, that this his doctrine died with him; since it is abundantly known, that it has still many votaries and patrons, who either hold it in secret, or profess it publicly.

XXXVI. The curious reader can be no stranger to the multitude of sects, some Christian, some Half-christian, some totally delirious, that have started up, at different times, both in *England* and *Holland*. It is difficult, indeed, for those, who live in other countries, to give accurate accounts of these separatists, as the books that contain their doctrines and views are seldom dispersed in foreign nations. We have, however, been lately favoured with some relations, that give a clearer idea of the Dutch sects, called *Verschorists* and *Hattemists*, than we had before entertained; and it will not therefore be improper, to give here some account of these remarkable communities. The former derives its denomination from JACOB VERSCHOOR, a native of *Flushing*, who, in the year 1680, out of a perverse and heterogeneous mixture of the tenets of COCCÆIUS and SPINOSA, produced a new form of religion equally remarkable for its extravagance and

Dutch sects —
Verschorists
Hattemists.

[u] This miserable argument, which does very little honour to the acuteness and ingenuity of BECKER, by proving too much, proves nothing at all; since, by the same method of reasoning, a man may prove that the supreme Being can neither influence, nor operate in, the moral world.]

[w] See LILIENTHALII *Selecta Historiæ Litterar.* p. i. observat. ii. p. 17. — *Miscellan. Lipsiens.* tom. i. p. 361. 364. where there is an explication of a satirical medal struck to expose the sentiments of BECKER. See also *Nouveau Diction. Hist. et Critique*, tom. i. p. 193.

CENT. XVII impiety. His disciples and followers were called *Hebrews*, on account of the zeal and assiduity with which they all, without distinction of age or sex, applied themselves to the study of the Hebrew language.

The *Hattemists* were so called from PONTIAN VAN HATTEM, a minister in the province of *Zeland*, who was also addicted to the sentiments of SPINOZA, and was, on that account, degraded from his pastoral office. The *Verschorists* and *Hattemists* resemble each other in their religious systems; though there must also be some points in which they differ; since it is well known, that VAN HATTEM could never persuade the former to unite their sect with his, and thus to form one communion. Neither of the two have abandoned the profession of the Reformed religion; they affect, on the contrary, an apparent attachment to it; and HATTEM, in particular, published a treatise upon the *Catechism of Heidelberg*. If I understand aright the imperfect relations, that have been given of the sentiments and principles of these two communities, both their founders began by perverting the doctrine of the Reformed church concerning *Absolute Decrees*, so as to deduce from it the impious system of a *fatal* and *uncontroulable necessity*. Having laid down this principle to account for the origin of all events, they went a step further into the domain of atheism, and denied "the difference between *moral* " *good* and *evil*, and the corruption of human nature." From hence they concluded, "That mankind were under no sort of obligation to correct " their manners, to improve their minds, or to endeavour after a regular " obedience to the divine laws—that the whole of religion consisted not in " *acting*, but in *suffering*; and that all the precepts of JESUS CHRIST are " reducible to this single one, that we bear with cheerfulness and patience " the events that happen to us through the divine will, and make it our " constant and only study to maintain a permanent tranquillity of mind."

This, if we are not mistaken, was the common doctrine of the two sects under consideration. There were, however, certain opinions or fancies, that were peculiar to HATTEM and his followers, who affirmed, " That CHRIST " had not satisfied the divine justice, nor made an expiation for the sins of " men by his death and sufferings, but had only signified to us, by his " mediation, that there was nothing in us, that could offend the Deity." " HATTEM maintained, that this was CHRIST's manner of justifying his " servants, and presenting them blameless before the tribunal of God." These opinions seem perverse and pestilential in the highest degree; and they evidently tend to extinguish all virtuous sentiments, and to dissolve all moral obligation. It does not however appear, that either of these innovators directly recommended immorality and vice, or thought that men might safely follow, without any restraint, the impulse of their irregular appetites and passions. It is at least certain, that the following maxim is placed among their tenets, *that God does not punish men FOR their sins, but BY their sins*; and this maxim seems to signify, that if a man does not restrain his irregular appetites, he must suffer the painful fruits of his licentiousness, both in a present and future life, not in consequence of any judicial sentence pronounced by the will or executed by the immediate hand of God, but according

according to some fixed law or constitution of nature [x]. The two sects CENT. XVII. still subsist, though they bear no longer the names of their founders.

XXXVII. The churches of *Switzerland*, so early as the year 1669, were alarmed at the progress, which the opinions of AMYRAUT, DE LA PLACE, and CAPELL, were making in different countries; and they were apprehensive that the doctrine, they had received from CALVIN, and which had been so solemnly confirmed by the synod of *Dort*, might be altered and corrupted by these new improvements in theology. This apprehension was so much the less chimerical, as, at that very time, there were, among the clergy of *Geneva*, certain doctors eminent for their learning and eloquence, who not only adopted these new opinions, but were also desirous, notwithstanding the opposition and remonstrances of their colleagues, of propagating them among the people [y]. To set bounds to the zeal of these innovators, and to stop the progress of the new doctrines, the learned JOHN HENRY HEIDEGGER, professor of divinity at *Zurich*, was employed, in the year 1675, by an assembly, composed of the most eminent Helvetic divines, to draw up a form of doctrine in direct opposition to the tenets and principles of the celebrated French writers mentioned above. The magistrates were engaged, without much difficulty, to give this production the stamp of their authority; and to add it to the other confessions of faith, received in the Helvetic church, under the peculiar denomination of the *Form of Concord*. This step, which seemed to be taken with pacific views, proved an abundant source of division and discord. Many declared, that they could not conscientiously subscribe this new form; and thus unhappy tumults and contests arose in several places. Hence it happened, that the canton of *Basil* and the republic of *Geneva*, perceiving the inconveniencies that proceeded from this new article of church communion, and strongly solicited, in the year 1686, by FREDERIC WILLIAM, elector of *Brandenburg*, to ease the burthened consciences of their clergy, abrogated this form [z]. It is nevertheless certain, that in the other cantons it maintained its authority for some time after this period; but in our time, the discords it has excited, in many places and

The disputes in Switzerland concerning the Consensus or form of concord.

[x] See THEOD. HASÆI *Dissert. in Museo Bremensi Theol. Philolog.* vol. ii. p. 144.—*Bibliothèque Belgique*, tom. ii. p. 203.

[y] See LETI *Istoria Genevrina*, part. iv. book v. p. 448. 488. 497, &c.

[z] It must not be imagined, from this expression of our historian, that this *Form*, entitled the *Consensus*, was abrogated at *Basil* by a positive edict. The case stood thus: Mr. PETER WERENFELS, who was at the head of the ecclesiastical consistory of that city, paid such regard to the letter of the elector, as to avoid requiring a subscription to this *Form* from the candidates for the ministry; and his conduct, in this respect, was imitated by his successors. The remonstrances of the elector do not seem to have had the same effect upon those that governed the church of *Geneva*; for the *Consensus*, or *Form of agreement*, maintained its credit and authority there until the year 1706, when, without being abrogated by any positive act, it fell into disuse. In several other parts of *Switzerland*, it was still imposed as a rule of faith, as appears by the letters addressed by GEORGE I, king of *England*, and also by the king of *Prussia*, in the year 1723, to the Swiss Cantons, in order to procure the abrogation of this *Form* or *Consensus*, which was considered as an obstacle to the union of the Reformed and Lutheran churches. See the *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire des troubles arrivées en Suisse à l'occasion du Consensus*, published in 8^{vo} at *Amsterdam*, in the year 1726.]

CENT. XVII. more particularly in the university of *Lausanne*, have contributed to deprive it of all its authority and to sink it into utter oblivion [a].

C H A P. III.

Concerning the ARMINIAN CHURCH.

The denomination of Arminians, whence,

I. THERE sprung forth from the bosom of the reformed church, during this century, two new sects, whose birth and progress were for a long time painful and perplexing to the parent that bore them. These sects were the *Arminians* and *Quakers*, whose origin was owing to very different principles; since the former derived its existence from an excessive propensity to improve the faculty of reason, and to follow its dictates and discoveries; while the latter sprung up, like a rank weed, from the neglect and contempt of human reason. The Arminians derive their name and their origin from JAMES ARMINIUS, or HARMENSEN, who was first pastor at *Amsterdam*, afterwards professor of divinity at *Leyden*, and who attracted the esteem and applause of his very enemies by his acknowledged candour, penetration, and piety [b]. They received also the denomination of *Remonstrants*, from an humble petition, entitled their *Remonstrances*, which they addressed, in the year 1610, to the states of *Holland*; and as the patrons of Calvinism presented an address, in opposition to this, which they called their *Counter-remonstrances*, so did they, in consequence thereof, receive the name of *Counter-remonstrants*.

The commencement of Arminianism.

II. ARMINIUS, though he had imbibed in his tender years the doctrines of *Geneva*, and had even received his theological education in the university of that city, yet rejected, when he arrived at the age of manhood, the sentiments, concerning the predestination and the Divine Decrees, that are adopted by the greatest part of the Reformed churches, and embraced the principles and communion of those, whose religious system extends the love

[a] See CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFII *Schediasma de formula Consensus Helvetica*, published in 4^{to} at *Tubingen*, in the year 1723.—*Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire des troubles arrivées en Suisse à l'occasion du Consensus*.

[b] The most ample account we have of this eminent man is given by BRANT, in his *Historia vitæ JAC. ARMINII*, published at *Leyden* in 8^{vo} in 1724; and the year after by me at *Brunswick*, with an additional *Preface* and some *Annotations*. See also *Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. et Critique*, tom. i. p. 471. All the works of ARMINIUS are comprised in one moderate quarto volume. The edition, I have now before me, was printed at *Francfort*, in the year 1634. They, who would form a just and accurate notion of the temper, genius, and doctrine of this divine, will do well to peruse, with particular attention, that part of his works that is known under the title of his *Disputationes publicæ et privatæ*. There is, in his manner of reasoning and also in his phraseology, some little remains of the scholastic jargon of that age; but we find nevertheless in his writings, upon the whole, much of that simplicity and perspicuity, which his followers have always looked upon, and still consider, as among the principal qualities of a Christian minister. For an account of the Arminian *Confessions of Faith* and the historical writers who have treated of this sect, see JO. CHRIST. KOECHERUS, *Biblioth. Theol. Symbolicæ*, p. 481.

of the supreme Being and the *merits* of JESUS CHRIST to all mankind [c]. As time and deep meditation had only served to confirm him in these principles, he thought himself obliged, by the dictates both of candour and conscience, to profess them publicly, when he had obtained the chair of divinity in the university of *Leyden*, and to oppose the doctrine and sentiments of CALVIN on these heads, which had been followed by the greatest part of the Dutch clergy. Two considerations encouraged him, in a particular manner, to venture upon this open declaration of his sentiments; for he was persuaded, on the one hand, that there were many persons, beside himself, and, among these, some of the first rank and dignity, that were highly disgusted at the doctrine of absolute decrees; and, on the other, he knew that the Belgic doctors were neither obliged, by their confession of faith, nor by any other public law, to adopt and propagate the principles of CALVIN. Thus animated and encouraged, ARMINIUS taught his sentiments publicly with great freedom and equal success, and persuaded many of the truth of his doctrine; but as Calvinism was at this time in a flourishing state in *Holland*, this freedom procured him a multitude of enemies, and drew upon him the severest marks of disapprobation and resentment from those that adhered to the theological system of *Geneva*, and more especially from FRANCIS GOMAR, his colleague. Thus commenced that long, tedious, and intricate controversy, that afterwards made such a noise in *Europe*; ARMINIUS died in the year 1609, when it was just beginning to involve his country in contention and discord [d].

III. After the death of ARMINIUS, the combat seemed to be carried on, during some years, between the contending parties, with equal success; so that it was not easy to foresee which side would gain the ascendant. The demands of the Arminians were moderate; they required no more than a bare toleration for their religious sentiments [e]; and some of the first men

The progress of
Arminianism.

[c] BERTIUS, in his *Funeral Oration* on ARMINIUS, BRANDT, in his *History of his Life*, p. 22. and almost all the ecclesiastical historians of this period, mention the occasion of this change in the sentiments of ARMINIUS. It happened in the year 1591, as appears from the remarkable letter of ARMINIUS to GRYNÆUS, which bears date that same year, and in which the former proposes to the latter some of his theological doubts. This letter is published in the *Biblioth. Brem. Theol. Philolog.* tom. iii. p. 384.

[d] The history of this controversy, and of the public discords and tumults it occasioned, is more circumstantially related by BRANDT, in the second and third volumes of his *History of the Reformation*, than by any other writer. This excellent history is written in Dutch; but there is an abridgment of it in French, in three volumes 8^{vo}, which has been translated into English. Add to this, UYTENBOUARD'S *Ecclesiastical History*, written also in Dutch.—LIMBORCH'S *Historia vitæ Episcopii*.—The *Epistolæ Clarorum Virorum*, published by LIMBORCH.—Those, who desire a more concise view of this contest, will find it in LIMBORCH'S *Relatio Historica de origine et progressu Controversiarum in Fœderato Belgio de Prædestinatione et capitibus annexis*, which is subjoined to the latter editions of his *Theologia Christiana*, or Body of Divinity. It is true, all these are Arminians, and, as impartiality requires our hearing both sides, the reader may consult TRIGLAND'S *Ecclesiastical History*, composed likewise in Dutch, and a prodigious number of Polemical writings published against the Arminians.

[e] This toleration was offered them in the conference held at the *Hague*, in the year 1611, provided they would renounce the errors of Socinianism. See TRIGLAND, *loc. cit.*—See also HENRY BRANDT'S *Collatio scripto habita Hagæ-comitum*, printed at *Zerickæ*, in 1715.]

CENT. XVII. in the republic, such as OLDEN BARNEVELDT, GROTIUS, HOOGERBEETS, and several others, looked upon these demands as reasonable and just. It was the opinion of these great men, that as the points in debate had not been determined by the *Belgic confession of faith*, every individual had an unquestionable right to judge for himself; and that more especially in a free state, which had thrown off the yoke of spiritual despotism and civil tyranny. In consequence of this persuasion, they used their utmost efforts to accommodate matters, and left no methods unemployed to engage the Calvinists to treat with Christian moderation and forbearance their dissenting brethren. These efforts were at first attended with some prospect of success. MAURICE, prince of Orange, and the Princess Dowager his mother, countenanced these pacific measures, though the former became afterwards one of the warmest adversaries of the Arminians. Hence a conference was held, in the year 1611, at the *Hague*, between the contending parties; another at *Delft* in the year 1613; and hence also that pacific edict issued out, in 1614, by the states of *Holland*, to exhort them to charity and mutual forbearance; not to mention a number of expedients applied in vain to prevent the schism that threatened the church [f]. But these measures confirmed, instead of removing, the apprehensions of the Calvinists; from day to day they were still more firmly persuaded, that the Arminians aimed at nothing less than the ruin of all religion; and hence they censured their magistrates with great warmth and freedom for interposing their authority to promote peace and union with such adversaries [g]. And those, who are well informed and impartial, must candidly acknowledge, that the Arminians were far from being sufficiently cautious in avoiding connexions with persons of loose principles; and that by frequenting the company of those, whose sentiments were entirely different from the received doctrines of the Reformed church, they furnished their enemies with a pretext for suspecting their own principles, and presenting their theological system, in the worst colours.

The five articles
of Arminianism.

IV. It is worthy of observation, that this unhappy controversy, which assumed another form, and was rendered more comprehensive by new subjects of contention after the synod of *Dort*, was, at this time, confined to the doctrines relating to Predestination and Grace. The sentiments of the Arminians concerning these intricate points were comprehended in *five articles*.

[f] The writers, who have given accounts of these transactions, are well known; we shall only mention the first and second volumes of the *Histoire de Louis XIII*, by LE VASSOR, who treats largely and accurately of these religious commotions, and of the civil transactions that were connected with them.

[g] The conduct of the States of *Holland*, who employed not only the language of persuasion, but also the voice of authority, in order to calm these commotions and restore peace in the church, was defended, with his usual learning and eloquence, by GROTIUS in two treatises. The one, which contains the general principles on which this defence is founded, is entitled, *De jure summarum potestatum circa sacra*; the other, in which these principles are peculiarly applied in justifying the conduct of the States, was published, in the year 1613, under the following title: *Ordinum Hollandiæ ac Westfrisiæ Pietas a multorum calumniis vindicata*.

They

They held, "1. That God, from all eternity, determined to bestow salvation on those, whom he foresaw would persevere unto the end in their faith in CHRIST JESUS; and to inflict everlasting punishments on those, who should continue in their unbelief and resist, unto the end, his divine succours:

"2. That JESUS CHRIST, by his death and sufferings, made an atonement for the sins of all mankind in general, and of every individual in particular:—that, however, none, but those who believe in him, can be partakers of their divine benefit.

"3. That *true faith* cannot proceed from the exercise of our natural faculties and powers, nor from the force and operation of free will; since man, in consequence of his natural corruption, is incapable either of thinking or doing any good thing; and that therefore it is necessary to his conversion and salvation, that he be *regenerated* and renewed by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which is the gift of God, through JESUS CHRIST.

"4. That this *Divine Grace*, or energy of the Holy Ghost, which heals the disorder of a corrupt nature, begins, advances, and brings to perfection every thing, that can be called *good* in man; and that, consequently, all good works, without exception, are to be attributed to God alone, and to the operation of his grace; that, nevertheless, this grace does not *force* the man to act against his inclination, but may be *resisted* and rendered *ineffectual* by the perverse will of the impenitent sinner.

"5. That they, who are united to CHRIST by faith, are thereby furnished with abundant strength, and with succours sufficient to enable them to triumph over the seduction of Satan, and the allurements of sin and temptation; but that the question, *Whether such MAY fall from their faith, and forfeit finally this state of grace?* has not been yet resolved with sufficient perspicuity, and must, therefore, be yet more carefully examined by an attentive study of what the holy Scriptures have declared in relation to this important point."

It is to be observed, that this last article was afterwards changed by the Arminians, who, in process of time, declared their sentiments with less caution, and positively affirmed, that *the saints might fall from a state of grace* [b].

If we are to judge of men's sentiments by their words and declarations, the tenets of the Arminians, at the period of time now under consideration, bear a manifest resemblance of the Lutheran system. But the Calvinists did not judge in this manner; on the contrary, they explained the words and declarations of the Arminians according to the notions they had formed of their hidden sentiments; and, instead of judging of their opinions by their expressions, they judged of their expressions by their opinions. They maintained, that the Arminians designed, under these specious and artful declarations, to insinuate the poison of Socinianism and Pelagianism into unwary

[b] The history of these *Five Articles*, and more particularly of their reception and progress in England, has been written by Dr. HEYLIN, whose book was translated into Dutch by the learned and eloquent BRANDT, and published at Rotterdam in the year 1687.

CENT. XVII. and uninstructed minds. The secret thoughts of men are only known to him, who is the searcher of hearts; and it is his privilege alone to pronounce judgment upon those intentions and designs that are concealed from public view. But, if we were allowed to interpret the *five articles* now mentioned in a sense conformable to what the leading doctors among the Arminians have taught in later times concerning these points, it would be difficult to shew, that the suspicions of the Calvinists were entirely groundless. For it is certain, whatever the Arminians may alledge to the contrary, that the sentiments of their most eminent theological writers, after the synod of *Dort*, concerning Divine Grace, and the other doctrines that are connected with it, approached much nearer to the opinions of the Pelagians and Semi-pelagians than to those of the Lutheran church.

Prince Maurice declares against the Arminians.

V. The mild and favourable treatment the Arminians received from the magistrates of *Holland*, and from several persons of merit and distinction, encouraged them to hope, that their affairs would take a prosperous turn, or at least that their cause was not desperate, when an unexpected and sudden storm arose against them, and blasted their expectations. This change was owing to causes entirely foreign to religion; and its origin must be sought for in those connexions, which can scarcely be admitted as possible by the philosopher, but are perpetually presented to the view of the historian. A secret misunderstanding had, for some time, subsisted between the Stadtholder MAURICE, prince of *Orange*, and some of the principal magistrates and ministers of the new republic, such as OLDENBARNEVELD, GROTIUS, and HOOGERBEETS; and this misunderstanding had at length broke out into an open enmity and discord. The views of this great prince are differently represented by different historians. Some alledge, that he had formed the design of getting himself declared count of *Holland*, a dignity which WILLIAM I, the glorious founder of Belgic liberty, is also said to have had in view [i]. Others affirm, that he only aspired after a greater degree of authority and influence than seemed consistent with the liberties of the republic; it is at least certain, that some of the principal persons in the government suspected him of aiming at supreme dominion. The lead-

[i] That MAURICE aimed at the dignity of Count of *Holland*, we learn from AUBERY's *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Hollande et des autres Provinces Unies*, sect. ii. p. 216. Ed. Paris. If we are to believe AUBERY (informed by his father, who was, at that time, ambassador of France at the Hague), OLDENBARNEVELD disapproved of this design, prevented its execution, and lost his life by his bold opposition to the views of the prince. This account is looked upon as erroneous by LE VASSOR, who takes much pains to refute it, and indeed with success, in his *Histoire de Louis XIII*, tom. ii. p. ii. p. 123. LE CLERC, in his *Biblioth. Choisie*, tom. ii. p. 134. and in his *History of the United Provinces*, endeavours to confirm what is related by AUBERY, and also affirms, that the project, formed by MAURICE, had been formed before by his father. The determination of this debated point is not necessary to our present purpose. It is sufficient to observe, what is acknowledged on all sides, that OLDENBARNEVELD and his associates suspected Prince MAURICE of a design to encroach upon the liberties of the republic, and to arrogate to himself the supreme dominion. Hence the zeal of BARNEVELD to weaken his influence and to set bounds to his authority: hence the indignation and resentment of MAURICE: and hence the downfall of the Arminian sect, which enjoyed the patronage, and adhered to the interests of OLDENBARNEVELD and GROTIUS.

ing men above-mentioned opposed these designs; and these leading men CENT. XVII. were the patrons of the Arminians. The *Arminians* adhered to these their patrons and defenders, without whose aid they could have no prospect of security or protection. Their adversaries the *Gomarists*, on the contrary, seconded the views, and espoused the interests of the prince, and inflamed his resentment, which had been already more or less kindled, by various suggestions, to the disadvantage of the Arminians, and of those who protected them. Thus, after mutual suspicions and discontents, the flame broke out with violence; and MAURICE resolved the downfall of those, who ruled the republic, without shewing a proper regard to his counsels; and also of the Arminians, who espoused their cause. The leading men, that sat at the helm of government, were cast into prison. OLDENBARNEVELD, a man of gravity and wisdom, whose hairs were grown grey in the service of his country, lost his life on a public scaffold; while GROTIUS and HOOGERBEETS were condemned to a perpetual prison [k], under what pretext, or in consequence of what accusations or crimes, is unknown to us [l].

[k] The truth of this general account of these unhappy divisions will undoubtedly be acknowledged by all parties, particularly at this period of time, when these tumults and commotions have subsided, and the spirit of party is less blind, partial, and violent. And the candid and ingenuous Calvinists who acknowledge this, will not thereby do the smallest prejudice to their cause. For should they even grant (what I neither pretend to affirm nor deny) that their ancestors, carried away by the impetuous spirit of the times, defended their religious opinions in a manner, that was far from being consistent with the dictates of moderation and prudence, no rational conclusion can be drawn from this, either against them or the goodness of their cause. For it is well known, both by observation and experience, that unjustifiable things have often been done by men, whose characters and intentions, in the general, were good and upright; and that a good cause has frequently been maintained by methods that would not bear a rigorous examination. What I have said with brevity on this subject is confirmed and amplified by LE CLERC, in his *Histoire des Provinces Unies*, and the *Biblioth. Choisie*, tom. ii. p. 134. and also by GROTIUS, in his *Apologeticus eorum, qui Hollandiæ et Westfrisiæ, et vicinis quibusdam nationibus præfuerunt ante mutationem quæ evenit*, An. 1618. The life of OLDENBARNEVELD, written in Dutch, was published at the Hague in 4^{to}. in the year 1648. The history of his trial, and of the judgment pronounced on the famous triumvirate, mentioned above, was drawn, by GERARD BRANDT, from authentic records, and published under the following title: *Histoire van de Rechtspleginge gehouden in den jaaren 1618 et 1619, omtrent de drie gevangene Heeren JOHANN VAN OLDENBARNEVELD, ROMBOUT HOOGERBEETS, en HUGO DE GROOT*; a third edition of this book, augmented with Annotations, was published in 4^{to} at Rotterdam, in the year 1723. The *History of the Life and Actions of GROTIUS*, composed in Dutch by CASPARD BRANDT and ADRIAN VAN CATTENBURGH, and drawn mostly from original papers, casts a considerable degree of light on the history of the transactions now before us. This famous work was published in the year 1727, in two volumes in folio, at Dort and Amsterdam, under the following title: *Historie van het leven des Heeren HUGO DE GROOT, beschreven tot den Anfang van zyn Gesandtschap wegens de Koninginne en Kroone van Zweden aan't Hof van Frankryck door CASPARD BRANDT, en vervolgt tot zyn dood door ADRIAN VAN CATTENBURGH*. Those, who desire to form a true and accurate notion of the character and conduct of GROTIUS, and to see him as it were near hand, must have recourse to this excellent work; since all the other accounts of this great man are insipid, lifeless, and exhibit little else than a poor shadow, instead of a real and animated substance. The life of GROTIUS composed by BURIGNI in French, and published successively at Paris and Amsterdam, in two volumes in 8°. deserves perhaps to be included in this general censure; it is at least a very indifferent and superficial performance. [See the following note.]

[l] Dr. MOSHEIM, however impartial, seems to have consulted more the authors of one side than of the other; probably because they are more numerous and more universally known. When he published this history, the world was not favoured with the *Letters, Memoirs, and Negotiations of*

CENT. XVII. As the Arminians were not charged with any violation of the laws, but merely with departing from the established religion, their cause was not of such a nature as rendered it cognizable by a civil tribunal. That, however, this cause might be regularly condemned, it was judged proper to bring it before an ecclesiastical assembly or national synod. This method of proceeding was agreeable to the sentiments and principles of the Calvinists, who are of opinion that all spiritual concerns and religious controversies ought to be judged and decided by an ecclesiastical assembly or council [m].

The synod of
Dort.

VI. Accordingly a synod was convoked at *Dort*, in the year 1618, by the counsels and influence of prince MAURICE [n], at which were present ecclesiastical deputies from the United Provinces, as also from the churches of *England*, *Hessia*, *Bremen*, *Switzerland*, and the *Palatinate*. The leading men among the Arminians appeared before this famous assembly to defend their cause; and they had at their head, SIMON EPISCOPIUS, who was, at that time, professor of divinity at *Leyden*, had formerly been the disciple of ARMINIUS, and was admired, even by his enemies, on account of the depth of his judgment, the extent of his learning, and the force of his eloquence. This eminent man addressed a discourse full of moderation, gravity, and elocution, to the assembled divines; but this was no sooner finished, than difficulties arose which prevented the conference, the Arminians had demanded in order to shew the grounds, in reason and scripture, on which their opinions were founded. The Arminian deputies proposed to begin the defence of their cause by refuting the opinions of the Calvinists their adversaries. This proposal was rejected by the synod, which looked upon the Arminians as a set of men that lay under the charge of heresy; and therefore thought it incumbent upon them first to declare and prove their own opinions, before they could be allowed to combat the sentiments of others. The design of the Arminians in the proposal they made was probably to get the people on their side, by such an unfavourable representation of the Calvinistical system, and of the harsh consequences, that seem deducible from it, as might excite a disgust, in the minds of those that were present, against its patrons and abettors. And it is more than proba-

Sir DUDLEY CARLETON; which Lord ROYSTON (now earl of HARDWICK) drew forth some years ago from his inestimable treasure of historical manuscripts, and presented to the public, or rather at first to a select number of persons, to whom he distributed a small number of copies of these *Negotiations*, printed at his own expence. They were soon translated both into Dutch and French; and, though it cannot be affirmed, that the spirit of party is no where discoverable in them, yet they contain anecdotes with respect both to OLDENBARNEVELD and GROTIUS, that the Arminians and the other patrons of these two great men have been studious to conceal. These anecdotes, though they may not be at all sufficient to justify the severities exercised against these eminent men, would, however, have prevented Dr. MOSHEIM from saying, that he knew not under what pretext they were arrested.]

[(m) Are the Calvinists particular in this? in what kind assembly ought debates purely theological to be decided? Not surely at a quarter sessions, or in a council of war.]

[(n) Our author always forgets to mention the order, issued out by the States general, for the convocation of this famous synod; and by his manner of expressing himself, and particularly by the phrase (*MAURITIO auctore*), would seem to insinuate, that it was by the prince that this assembly was called together.]

ble,

ble, that one of the principal reasons, that engaged the members of the synod to reject this proposal, was a consideration of the genius and eloquence of EPISCOPIUS, and an apprehension of the effects they might produce upon the multitude. When all the methods employed to persuade the Arminians to submit to the manner of proceeding, proposed by the synod, proved ineffectual, they were excluded from that assembly, and returned home complaining bitterly of the rigour and partiality with which they had been treated. Their cause was nevertheless tried in their absence, and, in consequence of a strict examination of their writings, they were pronounced guilty of pestilential errors, and condemned as corrupters of the true religion. This sentence was followed by its natural effects, which were the excommunication of the Arminians, the suppression of their religious assemblies, and the deprivation of their ministers. In this unhappy contest the candid and impartial observer will easily perceive that there were faults committed on both sides. Which of the contending parties is most worthy of censure is a point, whose discussion is foreign to our present purpose [o].

VII. We shall not here appreciate either the merit or demerit of the divines, that were assembled in this famous synod; but we cannot help observing that their sanctity, wisdom, and virtue have been exalted beyond all measure by the Calvinists, while their partiality, violence, and their other defects, have been exaggerated with a certain degree of malignity by the Arminians [p]. There is no sort of doubt, but that among the members of this assembly, who sat in judgment upon the Arminians, there were several persons equally distinguished by their learning, piety, and integrity, who acted with upright intentions, and had not the least notion, that the steps they were taking, or encouraging, were at all inconsistent with equity and wisdom. On the other hand, it appears with the utmost evidence, that the Arminians had reason to complain of several circumstances that strike us in the history of this remarkable period. It is plain, in the first place, that the ruin of their community was a point, not only premeditated, but determined even before the meeting of the national synod [q]; and that

The judgment
that ought to be
formed concern-
ing this synod.

[o] The writers who have given accounts of the synod of *Dort* are mentioned by JO. ALBERT. FABRICIUS, in his *Biblioth. Græc.* vol. xi. p. 723. The most ample account of this famous assembly has been given by BRANDT, in the second and third volumes of his *History of the Reformation in the United Provinces*; but as this author is an Arminian, it will not be improper to compare his relation with a work of the learned LEYDEKKER, in which the piety and justice of the proceedings of this synod are vindicated against the censures of BRANDT. This work, which is composed in Dutch, was published in two volumes in 4^{to} at *Amsterdam*, in the years 1705 and 1707; under the following title: *Eere van de Nationale Synode, van Dordrecht voorgestaan en bevestigd tegen de beschuldigingen van G. BRANDT.* After comparing diligently these two productions, I could see no enormous error in BRANDT; for in truth, these two writers do not so much differ about facts, as they do in the reasoning they deduce from them, and in their accounts of the causes from whence they proceeded. The reader will do well to consult the *Letters* of the learned and worthy Mr. JOHN HALES of *Eaton*, who was an impartial spectator of the proceedings of this famous synod, and who relates with candour and simplicity what he saw and heard.

[p] All that appeared unfair to the Arminians in the proceedings of this synod, has been collected together in a Dutch book, entitled, *Nullitegten, Misbandelingen, ende anbyllike Proceduren des Nationalen Synodi gehouden binnen Dordrecht, &c.*

[(q) This assertion is of too weighty a nature to be advanced without sufficient proof. Our author quotes no authority for it.]

this

CENT. XVII. this synod was not so much assembled to examine the doctrine of the Arminians, in order to see whether it was worthy of toleration and indulgence, as to publish and execute with a certain solemnity, with an air of justice, and with the suffrage and consent of foreign divines, whose authority was respectable, a sentence already drawn up and agreed upon by those who had the principal direction in these affairs. It is further to be observed, that the accusers and adversaries of the Arminians were their judges [r], and that BOGERMAN, who presided in this famous synod, was distinguished by his peculiar hatred of that sect; that neither the Dutch nor foreign divines had the liberty of giving their suffrage according to their own private sentiments, but were obliged to deliver the opinions of the princes and magistrates, of whose orders they were the depositaries [s]; that the influence of the lay-deputies, who appeared in the synod with commissions from the States-general and the prince of Orange, was still superior to that of the ecclesiastical members, who sat as judges; and, lastly, that the solemn promise, made to the Arminians, when they were summoned before the synod, that *they should be allowed the freedom of explaining and defending their opinions, as far as they thought proper, or necessary to their justification*, was manifestly violated [t].

The fate of the
Arminians after
the synod of
Dort.

VIII. The Arminians, in consequence of the decision of the synod, were considered as enemies of their country and of its established religion; and they were accordingly treated with great severity. They were deprived of all their posts and employments, whether ecclesiastical or civil; and, which they looked upon as a yet more intolerable instance of the rigour of their adversaries, their ministers were silenced, and their congregations were suppressed. They refused obedience to the order, by which their pastors were prohibited from performing, in public, their ministerial functions; and thus drew upon themselves anew the resentment of their superiors, who punished them by fines, imprisonment, exile, and other marks of ignominy. To avoid these vexations, many of them retired to *Antwerp*, others fled to *France*; while a considerable number, accepting the invitation sent to them by FREDERIC, duke of *Holstein*, formed a colony, which settled in the dominions of that prince, and built for themselves a handsome town, called *Frederickstadt*, in the dutchy of *Sleswyck*, where they still live happy and unmolested, in the open profession and free exercise of their religion. The heads of this colony were persons of distinction, who had been obliged to leave their native country on account of these troubles, particularly ADRIAN

[(r) This may, in some measure, be true; but how could this inconvenience be avoided?]

[(s) Here our author has fallen into a palpable mistake. The Dutch divines had no commission but from their respective consistories, or subordinate ecclesiastical assemblies; nor are they ever depositaries of the orders of their magistrates, who have lay-deputies to represent them both in provincial and national synods. As to the English and other foreign doctors that appeared in the synod of *Dort*, the case perhaps may have been somewhat different.]

[(t) See LE VASSOR, *Histoire du Regne de Louis XIII*, tom. iii. livr. xii. p. 365, 366.—and MOSHEIM's Preface to the Latin translation of HALE's account of the synod of *Dort*, p. 394—400.

VANDER WAEL, who was the first governor of the new city [u]. Among the persecuted ecclesiastics, who followed this colony, were, the famous VORSTIUS, who, by his religious sentiments, which differed but little from the Socinian system, had rendered the Arminians particularly odious, GREVINCKHOVIUS, a man of a resolute spirit, who had been pastor at Rotterdam, GOULART, GREVIUS, WALTERS, NARSIVS, and others [w].

IX. After the death of Prince MAURICE, which happened in the year 1625, the Arminian exiles experienced the mildness and clemency of his brother and successor FREDERIC HENRY, under whose administration they were recalled from banishment, and restored to their former reputation and tranquillity. Those, who had taken refuge in the kingdom of France and in the Spanish Netherlands, were the first that embraced this occasion of returning to their native country, where they erected churches in several places, and more particularly in the cities of Amsterdam and Rotterdam, under the mild shade of a religious toleration. That they might also have a public seminary of learning for the instruction of their youth, and the propagation of their theological principles, they founded a college at Amsterdam, in which two professors were appointed to instruct the candidates for the ministry, in the various branches of literature and science sacred and profane. SIMON EPISCOPIUS was the first professor of theology among the Arminians; and since his time the seminary, now mentioned, has been, generally speaking, furnished with professors eminent for their learning and genius, such as COURCELLES, POELENBURG, LIMBORCH, LE CLERC, CATTENBURGH [x], and WETSTEIN.

They are recalled from exile.

X. We have already seen, that the original difference between the Arminians and the Calvinists was entirely confined to the *five points* mentioned above, relative to the doctrines of Predestination and Grace; and it was the doctrine of the *former* concerning these points alone that occasioned their condemnation in the synod of Dort. It is further to be observed, that these five points, as explained at that time by the Arminians, seemed to differ very little from the Lutheran system. But after the synod of Dort, and more especially after the return of the Arminian exiles into their native country, the theological system of this community underwent a remarkable change, and assumed an aspect, that distinguished it entirely from that of all other Christian churches. For then they gave a new explication of these *five articles*, that made them almost coincide with the doctrine of those who

The ancient and modern system of Arminianism.

[u] The history of this colony is accurately related in the famous letters published by PHILIP LIMBORCH and CHRISTIAN HARTSOEKER, entitled, *Epistolæ præstantium et eruditorum virorum Ecclesiasticæ et Theologicæ*, of which the last edition was published in folio at Amsterdam, in the year 1704.—See also JO. MOLLERI *Introductio in Histor. Chersonesi-Cimbricæ*, p. ii. p. 108.—and PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ Diplomatici*, tom. iii. p. 714.

[w] For an ample account of VORSTIUS, see JO. MOLLERI *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 931. as also p. 242. 247. 249. 255. 576. where we find a particular account of the other ecclesiastics abovementioned.

[x] There is an accurate account of these and the other Arminian writers given by ADRIAN VAN CATTENBURGH, in his *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Remonstrantium*, printed in 8^{vo} at Amsterdam, in the year 1728.

CENT. XVII.

deny the necessity of divine succours in the work of conversion and in the paths of virtue. Nay, they went still further, and, bringing the greatest part of the doctrines of Christianity before the tribunal of reason, they modified them to their taste, and accommodated them to their theological system. ARMINIUS, the parent and founder of the community, was, undoubtedly, the inventor of this new form of doctrine, and taught it to his disciples [y]; but it was first digested into a regular system, and embellished with the charms of a masculine eloquence, by EPISCOPIUS, whose learning and genius have given him a place among the Arminian doctors, next to their founder [z].

The great end
proposed by the
Arminian sys-
tem, and its
principal heads.

XI. The great and ultimate end the Arminians seem to have in view, is, that Christians, though divided in their opinions, may be united in fraternal charity and love, and thus be formed into one family or community, notwithstanding the diversity of their theological sentiments. In order to execute their benevolent purpose, they maintain, that CHRIST demands from his servants more *virtue* than *faith*; that he has confined that belief, which is essential to salvation, to a few articles; that, on the other hand, the rules of practice, he has prescribed, are extremely large in their extent; and that charity and virtue ought to be the principal study of true Christians. Their definition of a true Christian is somewhat latitudinarian in point of belief. According to their account of things, every person is a genuine

[y] It is a common opinion, that the ancient Arminians, who flourished before the synod of Dort, were much more sound in their opinions, and strict in their morals; than those who have lived after this period; that ARMINIUS, himself, only rejected the Calvinistical doctrine of absolute decrees, and what he took to be its immediate consequences, adopting in all other points the doctrines received in the Reformed churches, but that his disciples, and more especially EPISCOPIUS, had boldly transgressed the bounds, that had been wisely prescribed by their master, and had gone over to the Pelagians and even to the Socinians. Such, I say, is the opinion commonly entertained concerning this matter. But it appears, on the contrary, evident to me, that ARMINIUS, himself, had laid the plan of that theological system, that was, in after times, embraced by his followers, and that he had instilled the main principles of it into the minds of his disciples; and that these latter, and particularly EPISCOPIUS, did really no more than bring this plan to a greater degree of perfection, and propagate, with more courage and perspicuity, the doctrines it contained. I have the testimony of ARMINIUS to support this notion, besides many others that might be alledged in its behalf; for, in the *last will* made by this eminent man a little before his death, he plainly and positively declares, that the great object he had in view, in all his theological and ministerial labours, was to unite in one community, cemented by the bonds of fraternal charity, all sects and denominations of Christians, the papists excepted: his words, as they are recorded in the funeral oration, which was composed on occasion of his death by BERTIUS, are as follow, *Ea proposui et docui . . . quæ ad propagationem, amplificationemque veritatis, religionis Christianæ, veri Dei cultus, communis pietatis, et sanctæ inter homines conversationis, denique ad CONVENIENTEM CHRISTIANO NOMINI TRANQUILLITATEM ET PACEM juxta verbum Dei POSSENT CONFERRE, EXCLUDENS EX IIS PAPATUM, cum quo nulla unitas fidei, nullum pietatis aut Christianæ pacis vinculum servari potest.* These words, in their amount, coincide perfectly with the modern system of Arminianism, which extends the limits of the Christian church, and relaxes the bonds of fraternal communion in such a manner, that Christians of all sects and all denominations, whatever their sentiments and opinions may be (papists excepted), may be formed into one religious body, and live together in brotherly love and concord.

[z] The life of this eminent man was composed in Latin by the learned and judicious LIMBORCH, and is singularly worthy of an attentive perusal. It was published at *Amsterdam* in 8°, in the year 1701,

subject

subject of the kingdom of CHRIST, " 1. Who receives the holy Scriptures, CENT. XVII.
 " and more especially the New Testament, as the rule of his faith, however
 " he may think proper to interpret and explain these sacred oracles ;
 " 2. Who abstains from idolatry and polytheism with all their concomitant
 " absurdities ; 3. Who leads a decent, honest, and virtuous life, directed
 " and regulated by the laws of God ; and 4. Who never discovers a spirit
 " of persecution, discord, or ill-will towards those who differ from him in
 " their religious sentiments, or in their manner of interpreting the holy
 " Scriptures." Thus the wide bosom of the Arminian church is opened to
 all who profess themselves Christians, however essentially they may differ
 from each other in their theological opinions. The papists alone are ex-
 cluded from this extensive communion, and this because they esteem it law-
 ful [a] to persecute those who will not submit to the yoke of the Roman
 pontif [b]. It is not our design here either to justify or to condemn these
 latitudinarian terms of communion ; it is true, indeed, that, if other
 Christian churches adopted them, diversity of sentiments would be no
 longer an obstacle to mutual love and concord.

XII. From all this it appears plainly enough, that the Arminian com-
 munity was a kind of *medley*, composed of persons of different principles,
 and that, properly speaking, it could have no fixed and stable form or
 system of doctrine. The Arminians, however, foreseeing that this circum-
 stance might be objected to them as a matter of reproach, and unwilling to
 pass for a society connected by no common principles or bond of union,
 have adopted, as their *Confession of Faith*, a kind of theological system drawn
 up by EPISCOPIUS, and expressed, for the most part, in the words and

The Armini-
 Confession o.
 Faith.

[a] It is not only on account of their *persecuting spirit*, but also on account of their *idolatrous*
worship, that the Arminians exclude the papists from their communion. See the following
 note.]

[b] For a full and accurate representation of this matter, the reader need scarcely have recourse
 to any other treatise, than that which is published in the first volume of the works of EPISCOPIUS
 (p. 508.) under the following title: *Verus Theologus Remonstrans, sive veræ Remonstrantium Theo-*
logiæ de errantibus dilucida declaratio. This treatise is written with precision and perspicuity.
 LE CLERC, in the *Dedication* prefixed to his Latin translation of Dr. HAMMOND'S *Paraphrase and*
Commentary on the New Testament, gives a brief account of the Arminian principles and terms of
 communion in the following words, addressed to the learned men of that sect: *You declare*, says he,
that they ONLY are excluded from your communion, who are chargeable with idolatry — who do not
receive the holy Scriptures as the rule of faith — who trample upon the precepts of CHRIST by their
licentious manners and actions — and who persecute those who differ from them in matters of religion *.
 Many writers affirm, that the Arminians acknowledge as their Brethren all those who receive that
 form of doctrine, that is known under the denomination of the *Apostle's Creed*. But that these
 writers are mistaken, appears sufficiently from what has been already said on this subject ; and is
 further confirmed by the express testimony of LE CLERC, who (in his *Biblioth. Ancienne et Mod.*
 tom. xxv. p. 119.) declares that it is not true, that the Arminians admit to their communion all
 those who receive the *Apostle's Creed* ; his words are, *Ils se trompent ; ils (the Arminians) offrent la*
communion à tous ceux, qui reçoivent l'écriture sainte comme la seule règle de la foi et des mœurs et qui
ne sont ni idolâtres ni persécuteurs.

* The original words of LE CLERC are, *Profiteri soletis . . . eos duntaxat a vobis excludi, qui (1)*
idololatria sunt contaminati, (2) qui minime habent scripturam pro fidei norma, (3) qui impuris moribus
sancta Christi præcepta conculcant, (4) aut qui denique alios religionis causa vexant.

CENT. XVII. phrases of holy Scripture [c]. But as none of their pastors are obliged, either by oath, declaration, or tacit compact, to adhere strictly to this confession, and as, on the contrary, by the fundamental constitution of this community, every one is authorised to interpret its expressions (which are in effect susceptible of various significations) in a manner conformable to their peculiar sentiments; it evidently follows, that we cannot deduce from thence an accurate and consistent view of Arminianism, or know with any degree of certainty what doctrines are adopted or rejected by this sect. Hence it happens, that the Arminian doctors differ widely among themselves concerning some of the most important doctrines of Christianity [d]; nor are they universally agreed or entirely uniform in their sentiments of almost any one point, if we except the doctrines of Predestination and Grace. They all, indeed, unanimously adhere to the doctrine, that excluded their ancestors from the communion of the Reformed churches, even *that the love of God extends itself equally to all mankind; that no mortal is rendered finally unhappy by an eternal and invincible decree; and that the misery of those that perish comes from themselves*; but they explain this doctrine in a very different manner from that in which it was formerly understood. Be that as it may, this is the fundamental doctrine of the Arminians, and whoever opposes it, becomes thereby an adversary to the whole community; whereas those, whose objections are levelled at particular tenets which are found in the writings of the Arminian divines, cannot be said, with any degree of propriety, to attack or censure the Arminian church, whose theological system, a few articles excepted, is vague and uncertain [e], and is not characterised by any fixed set of doctrines and principles. Such only attack certain doctors of that communion, who are divided among themselves, and do not agree, even in their explications of the doctrine relating to the extent of the divine love and mercy; though this be the fundamental point that occasioned their separation from the Reformed churches.

The present state
of Arminianism.

XIII. The Arminian church makes, at present, but an inconsiderable figure, when compared with the Reformed; and, if credit may be given to public report, it declines from day to day. The Arminians have still in the United Provinces thirty-four congregations, more or less numerous, which are furnished with eighty-four pastors; besides these, their church at *Fredericstadt*, in the dutchy of *Holstein*, still subsists. It cannot however be

[c] This Confession of Faith is extant in Latin, Dutch, and German. The Latin edition of it is to be found in the works of EPISCOPIUS, tom. ii. p. ii. p. 69.—Where may be found also a *Defence* of this *Confession* against the objection of the professors of divinity at *Leyden*.

[d] They, who will be at the pains of comparing together the theological writings of EPISCOPIUS, COURCELLES, LIMBORCH, LE CLERC, and CATTENBURGH, will see clearly the diversity of sentiments that reigns among the Arminian doctors.

[(e) What renders the Arminian *Confession of Faith* an uncertain representation of the sentiments of the community is, the liberty in which every pastor is indulged of departing from it, when he finds any of its doctrines in contradiction with his private opinions. See the *Introduction to the Arminian Confession of Faith*, in the third volume of the French abridgment of BRANDT's *History of the Reformation of the Netherlands*.]

said,

said, that the credit and influence of their religious principles have declined CENT. XVII. with the external lustre of their community; since it is well known, that their sentiments were early adopted in several countries, and were secretly received by many who had not the courage to profess them openly. Every one is acquainted with the change that has taken place in the established church of *England*, whose clergy, generally speaking, since the time of Archbishop LAUD, have embraced the Arminian doctrine concerning Predestination and Grace; and, since the restoration of CHARLES II, have discovered a strong propensity to many other tenets of the Arminian church. Besides this, whoever has any acquaintance with the world, must know, that, in many of the courts of protestant princes, and, generally speaking, among those persons that pretend to be wiser than the multitude, the following fundamental principle of Arminianism is adopted, "That those doctrines, whose belief is necessary to salvation, are very few in number; and that every one is to be left at full liberty, with respect to his private sentiments of God and religion, provided his life and actions be conformable to the rules of piety and virtue." Even the United Provinces, which saw within their bosom the defeat of Arminianism, are at this time sensible of a considerable change in that respect; for while the patrons of Calvinism in that republic acknowledge, that the community, which makes an external profession of Arminianism, declines gradually both in its numbers and influence; they, at the same time, complain, that its doctrines and spirit gain ground from day to day; that they have even insinuated themselves more or less into the bosom of the established church, and infected the theological system of many of those very pastors, who are appointed to maintain the doctrine and authority of the synod of *Dort*. The progress of Arminianism in other countries is abundantly known; and its votaries in *France*, *Geneva*, and many parts of *Switzerland*, are certainly very numerous.

The external forms of divine worship and ecclesiastical government in the Arminian church are almost the same with those that are in use among the *Presbyterians*. As, however, the leading men among the Arminians are peculiarly ambitious of maintaining their correspondence and fraternal intercourse with the church of *England*, and leave no circumstance unimproved that may tend to confirm this union; so they discover, upon all occasions, their approbation of the episcopal form of ecclesiastical government, and profess to regard it as most ancient, as truly sacred, and as superior to all other institutions of church-polity [f].

[f] Hence, to omit many other circumstances that shew unquestionably the truth of this observation, the Arminians have been at great pains to represent GROTIUS, their hero and their oracle, as a particular admirer of the constitution and government of the church of *England*, which he preferred before all other forms of ecclesiastical polity. See what LE CLERC has published on this subject at the end of the edition of GROTIUS's book, *De veritate religionis Christianæ*, which he gave at the *Hague* in the year 1724, p. 376.

C H A P. IV.

The HISTORY of the sect, called QUAKERS.

CENT. XVII. I.

The rise of the
Quakers —
George Fox.

THE sect of QUAKERS received this denomination, in the year 1650, from GERVAS BENNET, Esq. a justice of peace in *Derbyshire* [g], partly on account of the convulsive agitations and shakings of the body with which their discourses to the people were usually attended, and partly on account of the exhortation addressed to this magistrate by Fox and his companions, who, when they were called before him, desired him, with a loud voice and a vehement emotion of body, to *tremble at the word of the Lord*. However sarcastical this appellation may be, when considered in its origin, the members of this sect are willing to adopt it, provided it be rightly understood; they prefer, nevertheless, to be called, in allusion to that doctrine that is the fundamental principle of their association, *Children or Confessors of Light*. In their conversation and intercourse with each other, they use no other term of appellation than that of *Friend* [b].

This sect had its rise in *England*, in those unhappy times of confusion, anarchy, and civil discord, when every political or religious fanatic, that had formed new plans of government, or invented new systems of theology, came forth with his novelties to public view, and propagated them with impunity among a fickle and unthinking multitude. Its parent and founder was GEORGE FOX, a shoe-maker, of a dark and melancholy complexion, and of a visionary and enthusiastic turn of mind. About the year 1647, which was the twenty-third of his age, he began to strole through several counties in *England*, giving himself out for a person *divinely inspired*, and exhorting the people to attend to the voice of the *divine word*, that lies hid in the hearts of all men. After the execution of CHARLES I, when all laws both civil and ecclesiastical seemed to be entirely suspended, if not extinct, Fox exerted his fanatical powers with new vigour, and formed more ambitious and extensive views. Having acquired a considerable number of disciples of both sexes, who were strongly infected with his wild enthusiasm, he excited great tumults in several parts of *England*; and, in the year 1650, went so far as to disturb the devotion of those that were assembled in the churches for the purposes of public worship, declaring, that all such assemblies were useless and unchristian. For these extravagancies, both he and his companions were frequently cast into prison, and chastised, as disturbers of the peace, by the civil magistrate [i].

[g] See GEORGE SHEWEL's *History of the Quakers*, p. 23.—NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. iv. p. 32.

[b] SHEWEL, *loc. cit.* p. 624.

[i] Besides the ordinary writers of the ecclesiastical history of this century, the curious reader will do well to consult CROESII *Historia Quackeriana tribus Libris comprehensa*, the second edition of which was published in 8^{vo} at *Amsterdam*, in the year 1703. A physician, named KOLHANSIUS, who was born a Lutheran, but turned Quaker, published critical remarks upon this history, under the

II. This first association of *Quakers* was composed mostly of visionary fanatics, and of persons that really seemed to be disordered in their brains; and hence they committed many enormities, which the modern Quakers endeavour to alleviate and diminish, but which they neither pretend to justify nor to approve. For the greatest part of them were riotous and tumultuous in the highest degree; and even their female disciples, forgetting the delicacy and decency peculiar to their sex, bore their part in these disorders. They ran, like Bacchanals, through the towns and villages, declaimed against episcopacy, presbyterianism, and every fixed form of religion; railed at public and stated worship; affronted and mocked the clergy, even in the very exercise of their ministerial functions [k]; trampled upon the

The first attempts of this sect under Cromwell.

title of *Dilucidationes*, which were first printed at *Amsterdam* in the year 1696. And it must be acknowledged, that there are many inaccuracies in the history of CROESIVS; it is, however, much less faulty than another history of this sect, which was published at *Cologne* in 12^{mo}. in the year 1692, under the following title: *Histoire abrégée de la naissance et du progrès du Quakerisme avec celle de ses dogmes*; for the anonymous author of this latter history, instead of relating well-attested facts, has compiled, without either discernment or choice, such an extravagant medley of truth and falsehood, as is rather adapted to excite laughter than to administer instruction. See the second book of CROESIVS's *Historia Quakeriana*, p. 322 and 376. as also LE CLERC, *Biblioth. Universelle et Historique*, tom. xxii. p. 53.—The most ample and authentic account of this sect is that which was composed by GEORGE SHEWEL, from a great variety of genuine records, and partly from the papers of Fox, its founder, and published under the following title: *The History of the Christian People, called Quakers*. This work is remarkable both for the industry and accuracy, which the author has discovered in compiling it. But as SHEWEL was himself a Quaker, so he is sometimes chargeable with concealing, diminishing, or representing under artful colours, many things, which, if impartially related, must have appeared dishonourable, and might have proved detrimental, to his community. It must however be granted, that, notwithstanding these defects, SHEWEL's history is abundantly sufficient to enable an impartial and intelligent reader to form a just and satisfactory idea of this visionary sect. VOLTAIRE has also entertained the public with *Four Letters*, concerning the Religion, Manners, and History of the Quakers, in his *Mélanges de Littérature d'Histoire et de Philosophie*, which are written with his usual wit and elegance, but are rather adapted to amuse than instruct. The conversation between him and ANDREW PITT, an eminent Quaker in London, which is related in these Letters, may be true in general; but to render the account of it still more pleasing, the ingenious writer has embellished it with effusions of wit and fancy, and even added some particulars, that are rather drawn from imagination than memory. It is from the books already mentioned, that the French *Dissertation on the Religion of the Quakers* (which is placed in the third volume of the splendid work, entitled, *Ceremonies et Coutumes Religieuses de tous les Peuples*), is chiefly compiled, though with less attention and accuracy than might have been expected.—A Lutheran writer, named FREDERIC ERNEST MEIS, has given an account of the English Quakers in a German work, entitled, *Entwurf der Kirchen-Gründung und Gebräuche der Quäcker in England*.

[(k) A female, contrary to the modesty of her sex, came into *Whitehall Chapel* stark naked, in the midst of public worship, when CROMWELL was there present. Another came into the Parliament-house with a trenchard in her hand, which she broke in pieces, saying, *Thus shall he be broke in pieces*. THOMAS ADAMS, having complained to the protector of the imprisonment of some of his friends, and not finding redress, he took off his cap and tore it in pieces, saying, *So shall thy government be torn from thee and thy house*. Several, pretending an extraordinary message from heaven, went about the streets denouncing the judgments of God against the protector and his council; and one came to the door of the Parliament-house with a drawn sword, and wounded several, saying, *He was inspired by the Holy Spirit to kill every man that sat in that house*. The most extravagant Quaker, that appeared in this time, was JAMES NAYLOR, formerly an officer, a man of parts, and so much admired by these fanatics, that they blasphemously styled him, *The everlasting son of righteousness; the prince of peace; the only begotten son of God; the fairest among ten thousand*.]

laws

CENT. XVII.

laws and upon the authority of the magistrates under the pretext of being actuated by a divine impulse; and made use of their pretended inspiration to excite the most vehement commotions both in state and church. Hence it is not at all surprizing, that the secular arm was at length raised against these pernicious fanatics, and that many of them were severely chastised for their extravagance and folly [l]. CROMWELL himself, who was, generally speaking, an enemy to no sect, however enthusiastical it might be, entertained uneasy apprehensions from the frantic violence of the Quakers, and therefore, in his first thoughts, formed a resolution to suppress their rising community. But when he perceived, that they treated with contempt both his promises and threatenings, and were, in effect, too powerful or too headstrong to yield to either, he prudently abstained from the use of force, and contented himself with employing wise measures and precautions to prevent their fomenting sedition among the people, or undermining the foundations of his new sovereignty [m].

The progress of
this sect under
Charles II and
James II.

III. In process of time the fumes of this excessive fanaticism began to evaporate, and the ardent impetuosity of the rising sect seemed gradually to subside; nor did the *divine light*, of which the Quakers boast, produce such tumults in church and state, as at the first declaration of their celestial pretensions. Under the reign of CHARLES II, both their religious doctrine and discipline assumed a more regular and permanent form, by the care and industry of Fox, assisted, in this very necessary undertaking, by ROBERT BARCLAY, GEORGE KEITH, and SAMUEL FISHER, men of learning and abilities, who became, notwithstanding, members of this strange community. Fox stood in urgent need of such able assistants; for his gross ignorance had rendered his religion, hitherto, a confused medley of incoherent tenets and visions. The new triumvirate, therefore, used their utmost endeavours to digest these under certain heads, and to reduce them to a sort of theological system [n]. But such was the change of times, that the wiser and more moderate Quakers in *England* suffered more vexations, and were involved in greater calamities, than had fallen to the lot of their frantic and turbulent ancestors. These vexations, indeed, were not so much the consequence of their religious principles, as of their singular customs and manners in civil life. For they would never give to magistrates those titles of honour and pre-eminence that are designed to mark the respect due to their authority; they also refused obstinately to take the oath of allegiance to their sovereign [o], and to pay tithes to the clergy; hence they were looked

[l] NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. iv. p. 153.—SHEWEL's *History* &c. *passim*.

[m] CLARENDON tells us, in his *History of the Rebellion*, that the Quakers always persevered in their bitter enmity against CROMWELL. See SHEWEL's *History*, book i. p. 91. 113. 148, 149.

[n] For an account of the life and writings of BARCLAY, see the *General Dictionary*.—SHEWEL, in his *History of the Quakers*, gives an ample account of KEITH. There is also particular mention made of FISHER, in a German work, entitled, *Unschuldige Nachricht*, 1750, p. 338.

[o] This refusal to take the oath of allegiance did not proceed from any disaffection to the government, but from a persuasion that all oaths were unlawful, and that *swearing*, even upon the most solemn occasions, was forbidden in the New Testament. They also sincerely believed, that they were as much obliged to obedience by an *affirmation*, which they were willing to make, as by an oath.]

upon as rebellious subjects, and, on that account, were frequently punished with great severity [p]. Under the reign of JAMES II, and more particularly about the year 1685, they began to see more prosperous days, and to enjoy the sweets of toleration and liberty, which they owed not to the clemency of the government, but to the friendship of that monarch for the famous WILLIAM PENN [q], who had been employed by him in matters of the utmost moment, and had rendered him signal and important services [r]. What JAMES had done, from motives of a personal or political nature, in favour of the Quakers, King WILLIAM III confirmed and continued from a zeal for maintaining the rights of conscience, and advancing the cause of religious liberty. From these motives, he procured a full and ample toleration for dissenters of almost all denominations; and the Quakers, in consequence of this grant, enjoyed at length, upon a constitutional footing, tranquillity and freedom [s].

IV. Fatigued with the vexations and persecution, which they suffered in their native country during the reign of CHARLES II, the *Quakers* looked about for some distant settlements, where they might shelter themselves from the storm; and with this view began to disseminate their religious principles in various countries. Attempts of this nature were made in *Germany, Prussia, France, Italy, Greece, Holland, and Holstein*, but with little success. The Dutch however were, after much importunity, persuaded to allow a certain number of these enthusiasts to settle in *Holland*, where they still continue to reside. Multitudes of them also went over to *America*, and formed settlements there not long after the first rise of their sect; and it afterwards happened, by a singular concurrence of events, that this new world became the chief seat of their prosperity and freedom. WILLIAM PENN, son of the famous vice-admiral of that name, who embraced *Quakerism* in

The propagation
of Quakerism out
of England.

[p] See a circumstantial account of their sufferings under CHARLES II, in NEAL's *History of the Puritans*, vol. iv. p. 313. 353. 396. 432. 510. 518. 552. 569.—BURNET's *History of his own Times*, vol. i. p. 271.—SHEWEL, *loc. cit.* passim.

[q] See SHEWEL's *History of the Quakers*.

[r] The indulgence of JAMES II towards the *Quakers*, and other dissenters from the established church, was, at bottom, founded on a zeal for popery, and designed to favour the Roman-catholics. More particularly the order he sent to the Lord Mayor of London, the 7th of November, 1687, to dispense with the Quakers not swearing, was evidently designed to open a door to the Roman-catholics to bear offices in the state without a legal qualification.—At the same time, it is probable enough, that a personal attachment to the famous WILLIAM PENN may have contributed to render this monarch more indulgent to his sect than he would otherwise have been. The reasons of this attachment are differently represented. Some suppose it to have been owing to the services of his father in the fleet, commanded against the Dutch, in the year 1665, by King JAMES, when duke of York. Others attribute this attachment to his personal services. From the high degree of favour he enjoyed at court, they conclude that he was a concealed papist, and assisted the king in the execution of his designs. That the imputation of popery was groundless, appears from his correspondence with Dr. TILLOTSON, which is published in the *Life of PENN*, that is prefixed to the first volume of the works of the latter. It is nevertheless certain, that he was very intimate with Father PETERS the hot-headed Jesuit, whose bigotry formed the king's projects, and whose imprudence rendered them abortive. It is also certain, that, in the year 1686, he went over to *Holland* in order to persuade the prince of Orange to come into King JAMES's measures.]

[s] *Oeuvres de M. de VOLTAIRE*. tom. iv. p. 182.

CENT. XVII. the year 1668, received, in the year 1680, from CHARLES II, and from the English parliament, the grant of an ample, fertile, but uncultivated province in *America*, as a reward for the eminent services of his father. This illustrious Quaker, who was far from being destitute of parts, and whose activity and penetration were accompanied with an uncommon degree of eloquence [*t*], carried over with him into his new dominions a considerable colony of his *Friends* and Brethren; and he founded in those distant regions a republic, whose form, laws, and institutions resembled no other known system of government, whose pacific principles and commercial spirit have long blessed it with tranquillity and opulence, and which still continues in a prosperous and flourishing state [*u*]. The *Quakers* predominate in this colony both by their influence and their numbers; but all those who acknowledge the existence and providence of one supreme Being, and shew their respect to that Being, either by external worship, or at least by the regularity of their lives and actions, are admitted to the rights and privileges of citizens in this happy republic. The large province, that constitutes its territory, was called *Pennsylvania*, from the name of its proprietor; and its capital city was named *Philadelphia*, from the spirit of union and fraternal love that reigned at first, and is still supposed to prevail, more or less, among its inhabitants.

The intestine disputes and contests of the Quakers.

V. Even during the life of their founder, the Quakers, notwithstanding their extraordinary pretensions to fraternal charity and union, were frequently divided into parties, and involved in contests and debates. These debates, indeed, which were carried on in the years 1656, 1661, and 1683, with peculiar warmth, were not occasioned by any doctrines of a religious nature, but by a diversity of opinions about matters of discipline, about certain customs and manners, and other affairs of little moment; and they were generally terminated in a short time, and without much difficulty [*w*]. But after the death of Fox, which happened in the year 1691, some *Friends*, and more especially GEORGE KEITH, who was by far the most learned member of the community, excited, by their doctrines and innovations, new discords of a much more serious and momentous kind than those which had before divided the *Brethren*. This fountain of contention was opened in *Pennsylvania*, where KEITH was charged with erroneous opinions concerning several points of theology, and more particularly concerning the *Human Nature* of CHRIST, which he supposed to be two-fold, the one spiritual and

[(*t*) Bishop BURNET, who knew PENN personally, says, that "he was a talking, vain man, who had such a high opinion of his own eloquence, that he thought nothing could stand before it — and that he had a tedious, *luscious* way, that was not apt to overcome a man's reason, though it might tire his patience."]

[*u*] The laws and charters of the colony of *Pennsylvania* may be seen in RAPIN's History, PENN's Works, and in other collections of public records; they are also inserted in the *Bibliothèque Britannique*, tom. xv. p. 310. tom. xvi. p. 127. — PENN acquired a great reputation, both by his writings and the active figure he made in life. See the accounts given of him by SHEWEL and BURNET.

[*w*] See SHEWEL's *History of the Quakers*.

celestial,

celestial, the other corporeal and terrestrial [x]. This and other inventions of KEITH would perhaps have passed without censure, among a people who reduce the whole of religion to fancy and a kind of spiritual instinct, had not this learned man animadverted, with a certain degree of severity, upon some of the fantastic notions of the American Brethren, and opposed, in a more particular manner, their method of converting the whole history of CHRIST's life and sufferings into a mere allegory, or symbolical representation of the duties of Christianity. The European *Quakers* dare not so far presume upon the indulgence of the civil and ecclesiastical powers, as to deny openly the *reality* of the history of the life, mediation, and sufferings of CHRIST; but, in *America*, where they have nothing to fear, they are said to express themselves, without ambiguity, on this subject, and to maintain publicly, that CHRIST never existed, but in the hearts of the *faithful*. This point was debated between KEITH and his adversaries in several general assemblies of the sect, held in *England*, and was at length brought before the parliament. The contest was terminated, in the year 1695, by the excommunication of KEITH and his adherents, which so exasperated this famous *Quaker* [y], that he returned, some years after this, into the bosom of the English church, and died in its communion [z]. His friends and followers continued, for a long time, to hold their assemblies and exercise their religion in a state of separation from the rest of the sect; but now, if we may believe public fame, they are reconciled with their Brethren [a].

VI. The religion of the sect, called *Quakers*, has an air of novelty that strikes, at first sight; but, when viewed closely, it will appear to be nothing more than a certain modification of that famous *mystic theology*, which arose so early as the second century, was fostered and embellished by the luxuriant fancy of ORIGEN, and, passing through various hands, assumed different aspects, until it was adopted by the *Quakers*, who set off the motley form with new additions of their own invention. Fox, indeed, is not chargeable

The religion of the Quakers considered in a general point of view.

[x] *Ceremonies et Coûtumes de tous les Peuples du monde*, tom. iv. p. 141.—CROESII *Historia Quakeriana*, lib. iii. p. 446.

[(y) Bishop BURNET, who was certainly better acquainted with the history of KEITH (with whom he had been educated) than Dr. MOSHEIM, attributes his return to the church of *England* to a much worthier motive than irritation and resentment. He tells us, that KEITH, after that the American Quakers had appeared to him as little better than Deists, opposed them so warmly, that they sent him back to *England*. Here he opened a new meeting, and by a printed summons called together the whole party to convince them of these errors. "He continued these meetings," says the bishop, being still, in outward appearance a Quaker, for some years; till having prevailed "as far as he saw any appearance of success, he laid aside their exterior, and was reconciled to the church." See BURNET's *History of his own Times*, vol. ii. p. 249.]

[z] See BURNET, *ibid.*—SHEWEL's account of the troubles occasioned by KEITH, in his *History of the Quakers*. But SHEWEL was either unacquainted with the true nature and state of this controversy, which, as he was an illiterate man, may well have been the case, or he has given designedly a false and ambiguous representation of the matter. See the Life of KUSTER, in the *Europa Erudita* of RAHTLEFUS*, where this controversy is placed in its true light. KUSTER was a man of probity, who lived at that time in *America*, and was an eye-witness of these divisions.

[a] See ROGERS's *Christian Quaker*, published in 4^{to} at London, in the year 1699.—as also *The Quakers a Divided People*, published in 1708.—*Unschuldig. Nachricht*, 1744. p. 496.

* This work is written in German.

CENT. XVII. with these inventions; his ignorant and inelegant simplicity places him beyond the reach of suspicion in this matter; but it is, at the same time, undoubtedly certain, that all his doctrine concerning the *internal word*, and the divine light within its operations and effects, was either borrowed from the writings of the Mystics, which were, at that time, in the hands of many, or at least picked up from the conversation and expressions of some persons of the Mystic order. The tenets, however, which this blunt and illiterate man expressed in a rude, confused, and ambiguous manner, were dressed up and presented under a different form by the masterly hands of BARCLAY, KEITH, FISHER, and PENN, who digested them with such sagacity and art, that they assumed the aspect of a regular system. The Quakers may therefore be deemed with reason the principal branch of the Mystics, as they not only embraced the precepts of their *hidden wisdom*, but even saw its whole tendency, and adopted, without hesitation, all its consequences [b].

[b] Most people are of opinion, that we are to learn the true doctrine and sentiments of the Quakers from the *Catechism* of ROBERT BARCLAY, and more especially from his *Apology for the true Christian Divinity*, &c. which was published at London in 4^{to}. in the year 1676, and was translated into several foreign languages. Nor do I deny, that the members of this sect are very desirous that we should judge of their religious sentiments by the doctrine that is exhibited in these books. But if those who are disposed to judge by this rule, go so far as to maintain, that these books contain all the religious tenets, that have formerly been advanced, or are at present adopted, by the people called Quakers, they may be refuted, without difficulty, from a great variety of books and records of unquestionable authenticity. It is necessary to enter into the true spirit of BARCLAY's writings. This ingenious man appeared as a *Patron* and *Defender* of Quakerism, and not as a professed teacher or expositor of its various doctrines; and he interpreted and modified the opinions of his sect after the manner of a champion or advocate, who undertakes the defence of an odious cause. How then does he go to work? In the first place, he observes an entire silence in relation to those fundamental principles of Christianity, concerning which it is of great consequence to know the real opinions of the Quakers; and thus he exhibits a system of theology, that is evidently lame and imperfect. For it is the peculiar business of a prudent apologist to pass over in silence points, that are scarcely susceptible of a plausible defence, and to enlarge upon those only which the powers of genius and eloquence may be able to embellish and exhibit in an advantageous point of view. It is observable, in the second place, that BARCLAY touches in a slight, superficial, and hasty manner some tenets, which, when amply explained, had exposed the Quakers to severe censures; and in this he discovers plainly the weakness of his cause. Lastly, to omit many other observations that might be made here, this writer employs the greatest dexterity and art in softening and modifying those invidious doctrines, which he cannot conceal, and dare not disavow; for which purpose he carefully avoids all those phrases and terms that are made use of by the Quakers, and are peculiar to their sect, and expresses their tenets in ordinary language, in terms of a vague and indefinite nature, and in a style that casts a sort of mask over their natural aspect. At this rate, the most enormous errors may be held with impunity; for there is no doctrine, however absurd, to which a plausible air may not be given by following the insidious method of BARCLAY; and it is well known, that even the doctrine of SPINOSA was, with a like artifice, dressed out and disguised by some of his disciples. The other writers of this sect have declared their sentiments with more freedom, perspicuity, and candour, particularly the famous WILLIAM PENN and GEORGE WHITEHEAD, whose writings deserve an attentive perusal preferably to all the other productions of that community. There is, among other writings of these eminent Quakers, one in whose composition they were both concerned, and which was published at London, in the year 1674, under the following title: *The Christian Quaker and his Divine Testimony vindicated, by Scripture, Reason, and Authorities, against the injurious Attempts that have been lately made by several Adversaries*. The first Part of this book was written by PENN; and the Second by WHITEHEAD. There is also in SHEWEL's History, a *Confession of Faith*, that was

VII. The fundamental doctrine of *Quakerism*, from whence all their other tenets are derived, is that famous and ancient opinion of the Mystic school, *That there lies concealed in the minds of all men a certain portion of divine reason, a spark of the same wisdom that exists in the supreme Being.* Therefore, those who are desirous of arriving at true felicity and eternal salvation, must, according to their system, by self-converse, contemplation, and perpetual efforts to subdue their sensual affections, endeavour to draw forth, kindle, and inflame that *divine, hidden spark*, which is overpowered by the *darkness of the flesh*, and suffocated, as it were, by that mass of matter, with which it is surrounded. They who observe this rule will feel, say the Quakers, a divine glow of warmth and light, and hear a celestial and divine voice proceeding from the inward recesses of their souls; and by this light and this voice they will be led to all truth, and be perfectly assured of their union with the supreme Being." This hidden treasure, which is possessed, though not improved, by all the human race, bears different denominations in the language of this fanatical sect. They frequently call it *divine light*, sometimes a *ray of the eternal wisdom*, at others, the *heavenly Sophia*, whom they suppose married to a mortal, and whose wedding-garments some of their writers describe with the most gaudy and pompous eloquence. But the most usual epithets given to this spiritual treasure are those of the *internal word*, and of *CHRIST within*; for as, on the one hand, they adopt that doctrine of ORIGEN, and the ancient Mystics, which represents *CHRIST*, as the eternal reason, or wisdom of God; and, on the other, maintain, that all men are endowed naturally with a certain portion of the divine wisdom; they are thus directly led to affirm, that *CHRIST*, or the *word* of God, dwells and speaks in the hearts of all men [c].

The principal
tenets of the
Quakers.

VIII. All the singularities and wonderful fancies, that are to be found in the religious system of the Quakers, are the immediate consequences of the fundamental principle now mentioned. For since *CHRIST* resides in the inward frame of every mortal; it follows, "First, that the whole of religion consists in calling off the mind from external objects, in weakening the influence and ascendant of the outward senses, and in every one's entering deeply into the inmost recesses of his heart, and listening attentively to the divine instructions and commands, that the *internal word* or *CHRIST within* delivers there; secondly, that the *external word*, i. e. the holy Scripture, neither points out the way of salvation, nor leads men to it; since it only consists of *letters* and *words*, which, being *void of life*, have not a degree of efficacy and power, sufficient to *illuminate* the human mind and to unite it to God. The only advantage that, in their opinion,

The tenets that
flow from this
fundamental
doctrine.

published by the Quakers in the year 1693, during their controversy with KEITH; but this confession is composed with great prudence, and is full of ambiguity.

[c] It is, nevertheless, to be observed, that the modern Quakers, as appears from the writings of MARTIN and others, are, generally speaking, ignorant of the system of their ancestors, and perpetually confound the innate, divine light abovementioned, with the operations of the Holy Ghost in the minds of the faithful.

CENT. XVII. " results from a perusal of the holy Scriptures, is that they excite the mind
 " to listen to the dictates of the *internal word*, and to go to the school of
 " CHRIST, who teaches *within them*; or, to express the same thing in other
 " words, they look upon the Bible, as a mute master, who, by signs and
 " figures, points out and discovers that *living master* and effectual guide who
 " dwells in the mind; *Thirdly*, that they, who are without this written
 " word, such as the Jews, Mahometans, and savage nations, are not, on
 " that account, either removed from the path or destitute of the doctrine
 " of salvation, though they, indeed, want this inferior and subordinate help
 " to its attainment. For if they only attend to this *inward teacher*, who al-
 " ways *speaketh*, when the *man* is *silent*, they will learn abundantly, from
 " him, all that is necessary to be known and practised in order to their final
 " happiness; that of consequence, *fourthly*, the kingdom of CHRIST is of a
 " vast extent, and comprehends the whole race of mankind. For all have
 " CHRIST within them, and therefore, even those, who are deprived of the
 " means of knowledge, and live in the grossest ignorance of the Christian
 " religion, are capable of obtaining, through him, wisdom here, and hap-
 " piness hereafter. Hence also they conclude, that those who lead virtuous
 " lives, and resist the impulse of their lusts and passions, whether they be
 " Jews, Mahometans, or Polytheists, shall be united to God in this life, by
 " means of the CHRIST that lies hidden within them, and shall enjoy the
 " fruits of this union in the life to come. To these tenets they add, in the
 " *fifth* place, that a heavy, dark body, composed of corrupt matter, hinders
 " men from discerning, with ease, this *hidden* CHRIST, and from hearing his
 " divine and internal voice. Therefore they look upon it as a matter of
 " the highest importance, to watch against the pernicious consequences of
 " this union between the soul and body, that the latter may not blunt the
 " powers of the former, disturb its tranquillity, or, by the ministry of the
 " outward senses, fill it with the images of vain, sensible, and external ob-
 " jects." The consideration now mentioned engages them, *lastly*, " to look
 " upon it as utterly incredible, that God should ever again shut up, in the
 " same material habitation, the souls that are set free by death from their
 " bodily prison; and therefore they affirm, that the Gospel-account of the
 " resurrection of the body must either be interpreted in a figurative sense,
 " or be understood as pointing out the creation of a new and celestial
 " body [*d*]."

Their doctrine
 concerning
 Christ.

IX. It appears evidently from all this, that the existence of the man CHRIST JESUS, together with the circumstantial accounts, we have in Scripture, of his divine origin, his life, and actions, his satisfaction, merits, and sufferings, make no essential part of the theological system of the Quakers, which is built upon a different foundation, and derives the whole plan and method of salvation from the CHRIST *within*. Hence several members of that sect,

[*d*] The Quakers adopt all these tenets; they are at least obliged to adopt them, unless they renounce the fundamental principles of their system. We have omitted the mention of those points about which they dispute among themselves, that we may not appear to take pleasure, in representing them under odious colours.

as we learn from writers of unquestionable authority, went such an extravagant length as to maintain, that the accounts we have of JESUS CHRIST, in the Gospel-history, do not relate to the son of God, who took upon him the nature of man, but to that CHRIST *within*, whose operations are recorded by the sacred historians in a figurative and allegorical language. This opinion, if we may confide in the testimonies of unexceptionable witnesses, is so far from having lost its credit among them, that it is still openly professed by the American Quakers. Those of *Europe*, whether from the force of conviction or the suggestions of prudence, differ entirely from their Brethren in this respect; they hold, "That the divine *wisdom* or *reason* resided in the Son of the Virgin MARY, and conveyed its instructions to mankind by his ministry;" and they profess to believe, "That this divine man *really* did and suffered what is recorded concerning him by the sacred writers." It is nevertheless certain, that they express themselves in a very ambiguous manner on many points that relate to the history of the divine Saviour; and, in a more particular manner, their notions concerning the fruits of his sufferings and the efficacy of his death are so vague and obscure, that it is very difficult to know, what is their real opinion about the degree of this efficacy and the nature of these fruits. It is still further worthy of observation, that the European Quakers, though they acknowledge the *reality* of the life, actions, and sufferings of CHRIST, yet do not entirely reject the allegorical interpretation of our Saviour's History mentioned above; for they consider the events, that happened to CHRIST in the course of his ministry here upon earth, as the signs and emblems of those scenes through which the *Mental* CHRIST must pass, in order to render us partakers of eternal salvation. Hence they talk in high-swollen and pompous strains (like their models the Mystics) of the birth, life, sufferings, death, and resurrection of CHRIST *in the hearts of the faithful*.

X. The religious discipline, worship, and practice of the Quakers flow from the same original source, from which, as we have already observed, their doctrine and tenets were immediately derived. They meet for the purposes of religion on the same days, which are set apart for the celebration of public worship in all other Christian churches; but they neither observe festivals, nor use external rites and ceremonies, nor suffer religion, which they place entirely in the mental worship of the *Hidden* CHRIST, to be shackled and cramped by positive institutions. All the members of their community, whether male or female, have an equal right to teach and exhort in their public meetings; for who, say they, will presume to exclude from the liberty of speaking to the *Brethren*, those persons, in whom CHRIST dwells, and by whom he speaks? They reject the use of prayers, hymns, and the various outward forms of devotion, by which the public worship of other Christian churches is distinguished; and this, indeed, is an instance of their consistency with themselves, as it is the immediate consequence of their religious system; for in their judgment it is not the person, who expresses his desires in a set form of words, that can be said to pray truly, but he, on the contrary, who, by a deep recollection, withdraws his mind from every

Their religious discipline and worship.

CENT. XVII every outward object, reduces it to a state of absolute tranquillity, silences every inward motion and affection, and plunges it, as it were, into the abyfs of Deity. They neither observe the institution of *Baptism*, nor do they renew the remembrance of CHRIST's death and of the benefits that result from it, by the celebration of the *Eucharist*. They look upon these two institutions as merely Judaical, and alledge, that our Saviour observed them for no other end than to shew for once, in a visible manner, the mystical purification of the soul, under the figure of baptism, and the spiritual nourishment of the inward man, under that of the *Eucharist*.

Their moral
precepts.

XI. The moral doctrine of the Quakers, which is remarkable for its excessive austerity, is chiefly comprehended in the two following precepts: *First*, "That the faithful are either to avoid entirely every thing that tends to gratify the external senses and passions, every thing that can be ranked under the denomination of sensual or bodily pleasure; or, if such rigorous abstinence be impossible in this present state, and contrary to the evident laws of nature, such pleasure is to be so modified and restrained by reason and meditation, as to prevent its debasing and corrupting the mind. For as the whole attention of the mind must be given to the voice and orders of the *internal guide*, so, for this purpose, all possible care must be taken to remove it from the contagion of the body, and from all intimate and habitual commerce with corporeal objects." By the *second* leading precept of morality among the Quakers, all imitation of those external manners, that go by the name of civility and politeness, as also several matters of form, usual in the conduct of life and in the connexions of human society, are strictly prohibited as unlawful. Hence they are easily distinguished from all other Christian sects by their outward deportment and their manner of life. They never salute any person they meet in their way, nor employ in their conversation the usual manner of address and the appellations that civility and custom have rendered a matter of decency at least, if not of duty; they never express their respect for magistrates or persons in authority either by bodily gestures, titles of honour, or in general by any of the marks of homage, that are paid them by persons of all other denominations. They carry their pacific sentiments to such an extravagant length, as to renounce the right of self-defence, and let pass with impunity, and even without resistance, the attacks that are made on their possessions, their reputation, nay, on their lives. They refuse to confirm their testimonies by an oath, to appear in behalf of their property before a civil tribunal, or to accuse those who have injured them. To these negative parts of their external conduct, they add peculiar circumstances of a positive kind, that discover the same austere, stiff, proud, and formal spirit; for they distinguish themselves, in a striking manner, from the rest of their fellow-citizens, by the gravity of their aspect, the rustic simplicity of their apparel, the affected tone of their voice, the stiffness of their conversation, and the frugality of their tables. It is, however, affirmed by persons of credit, who are eye-witnesses of what passes among the members of this sect, that the modern, and more especially the English Quakers, whom trade has furnished with the

the means of luxury, have departed from this rigid and austere manner of life, and daily grow more reconciled to the outward pleasures and enjoyments of the world. These more sociable Quakers are also said to modify and explain the theology of their ancestors, in such a manner, as to render it more rational than it was in its primitive state. At the same time it is certain, that many of the members of this sect have either a false notion, or no notion at all, of that ancient theology.

XII. The principles of this community seem to exclude the very idea of order, discipline, and ecclesiastical government. Its leading members, however, began to perceive, in process of time, that without laws and rulers it could not subsist, but must inevitably fall into confusion and ruin. They accordingly erected a council of *Elders*, who discuss and determine matters of a doubtful or difficult nature, and used all possible care and diligence in inspecting the conduct of the Brethren, and in preventing whatever they look upon as prejudicial to the interests of the community. The names of those, that enter into the state of wedlock, are given in to those leading members, who also keep an exact register of the births and deaths that happen in their society. They exercise, moreover, a certain degree of authority over those who speak in their meetings; since it is well known, that in some places, these speakers shew their discourses to the ruling Elders before they deliver them, in order that they may judge whether or no they are fit to be repeated in public. For since the abuse that was made of the unbounded liberty that every individual had to instruct and exhort the congregation, and to speak and harangue when the pretended *spirit moved them*, new regulations have been observed; and this liberty has been considerably modified, in several places, to avoid the mockery, contempt, and censure to which the community was constantly exposed by the absurd, incoherent, and insipid discourses of many of its members. There are also in some of the more considerable congregations, and more especially in those that are erected at *London*, certain persons whose vocation it is to be always prepared to speak to the people, in case none of the congregation find themselves *inwardly moved* or disposed to perform that office. The appointment of these professed speakers was designed to remedy an inconveniency that frequently happened in the Quaker-meetings, even, that the whole assembly was dismissed without either instruction or exhortation, because none found themselves *moved* to speak. It is indeed to be observed, that this public discourse is not looked upon, by the Quakers, as an essential part of their religion and worship; for the *Brethren* and *Sisters* do not meet, that they may hear the words of an external teacher, but that they may listen with recollection to the voice of the *divine instructor*, which every one carries with him, in his own breast, or, to use their own phrase, that they may *commune with themselves*. Nevertheless, as these mute assemblies excite the laughter of their adversaries, and expose them to the reproach of enthusiasm and frenzy, they have, on that account, appointed fixed speakers, to whom they give a small salary, that the whole time of their meeting may not be passed in silence.

Their form of
ecclesiastical go-
vernment.

CENT. XVII.

The Quakers have, annually, a general assembly of the whole sect, which meets at *London* the week before Whit-Sunday, and is composed of deputies from all their particular congregations. They still complain, notwithstanding the toleration they enjoy, of certain severities and hardships; but these are entirely owing to their obstinate refusal to pay those tithes, which, by the laws of the land, are designed for the support of the established church.

C H A P. V.

Concerning the MENNONITES, or ANABAPTISTS.

The various fortunes of the Mennonites.

I. AFTER various scenes of trial and perplexity, the Mennonites at length found, during this century, the tranquillity they had long sought after in vain. They arrived, indeed, at this state of repose by very slow steps; for though, in the preceding age, they were admitted to the rights and privileges of citizens in the United Provinces, yet it was a long time before their solicitations and pleas of innocence could engage the English, the Swiss and Germans to receive them in their bosom, and to abrogate the laws that had been enacted against them. The civil magistrates, in these countries, had still before their eyes the enormities committed by the ancient Anabaptists; and besides, they could not persuade themselves, that a set of men, who looked upon all oaths as *sinful*, and declared that magistracy and penal laws have no place in the kingdom of CHRIST, had the qualities and sentiments that are necessary to constitute a good citizen. Hence we find, even in this century, several examples of great severities employed against the Anabaptists, and some instances of even capital punishments being inflicted on them [e]. But now, that the demonstrations of their innocence and probity are clear and unquestionable, they enjoy the sweets of security and repose, not only in the United Provinces, but also in *England*, *Germany*, and *Prussia*, where they procure, by their honest industry, and particularly by their application to trade and commerce, an ample subsistence for themselves and their families.

Union and concord restored among them.

II. The wiser members of this community easily perceived, that their external tranquillity would neither be stable nor permanent, unless their intestine discords were removed, and their ancient disputes, about trifling

[e] The severities exercised in *Switzerland* against the *Mennonites* are recorded by OTTIUS, in his *Annal. Anabapt.* p. 337. and more particularly those that they suffered, in the year 1693, by HOTTINGER, in his German work, entitled, *Schweizerische Kircken-Historie*, vol. i. p. 1101. nor, even in this present century, have they been treated more mildly in the Canton of *Bern*, as appears from SCHYN's *Historia Mennonitar.* cap. x. p. 289. in which we find the letters of the States general of the United Provinces interceding with that Canton in their behalf. A severe persecution was set on foot against them in the *Palatinate* in the year 1694, which was suspended by the intercession of WILLIAM III, king of *Great-Britain*. See SCHYN, *ibid.* p. 265. Bishop BURNET mentions some instances of Anabaptists suffering death in *England* during the seventeenth century, in the first volume of his *History of his own Times*.

and

and unimportant matters, charitably terminated. They accordingly used CENT. XVII. their most zealous endeavours to diffuse the sweets of charity and concord throughout their sect; nor were their labours altogether unsuccessful. In the year 1630, a considerable part of the Anabaptists of *Flanders, Germany* and *Friesland*, concluded their debates in a conference held at *Amsterdam*, and entered into the bonds of fraternal communion, each notwithstanding reserving to themselves a liberty of retaining certain opinions. This association was renewed, and confirmed by new resolutions, in the year 1649, by the Anabaptists of *Flanders* and *Germany*, between whom great divisions had reigned [f]. All these formed a bond of union with those branches of the sect that were most distinguished by their moderation; and they mitigated and corrected, in various respects, the rigorous laws of MENNO and his successors.

III. Therefore, at this day, the whole community may be divided into two large sects, the one comprehending the more *Refined* Anabaptists, remarkable for their austerity, who are also called *Flemings* or *Flandrians*; and the others (called in the Dutch-language) the *Grosser* Anabaptists, who are of a milder complexion and an easier and more moderate character, and go commonly under the denomination of *Waterlandians*. We have given already a particular account of the origin and etymology of these denominations. Each of these sects is subdivided into a variety of branches, more especially the *refined* and austere Anabaptists, who have not only produced two separate societies, distinguished by the names of *Groninganiſts* [g] and *Dantzigers* or *Prussians* [h], but also a considerable number of more obscure and inconsiderable factions, which differ in doctrine, discipline, and manners; and agree in nothing, but the name of Anabaptists and in some ancient opinions that have been unanimously embraced by all the members of that sect. All the refined *Anabaptists* are the rigid followers of SIMON MENNO, and stedfastly maintain, though not all with the same degree of severity and rigour, the sentiments of their chief on the following points—the human nature of CHRIST—the obligation that binds us to wash the feet of strangers in consequence of our Saviour's command—the necessity of excommunicating and of avoiding, as one would do the plague, not only avowed sinners, but also those who depart, even in some light instances, from the simplicity of their ancestors, and are tainted with any appearance of evil—the contempt that is due to human learning, and other matters of less moment [i]. It is however to be observed, that, in our times, some of the congregations of this *refined* sect have been gradually departing from this austere system, and are proceeding, though with a slow pace, towards the opinions and discipline of the more moderate Anabaptists.

Different sects of Anabaptists.

[f] HERM. SCHYN, *Plenior Deductio Historiæ Mennonit.* p. 41, 42.

[g] So called, because they meet at certain stated times in the city of *Groningen*.

[h] They derive this denomination from their adopting the manners and discipline of the *Prussians*.

[i] See a German work, entitled, *Nachrichten von dem gegenwärtigen Zustande der Mennoniten*, by RUES, 1743.

CENT. XVII.

The external
form of the
Mennonite
church.

IV. All these Anabaptists adopt a form of ecclesiastical government and discipline, that is administred by three distinct orders of persons. The first order is that of the *Bishops* or *Presbyters*, who always preside in the consistory, and are alone invested with the power of administering the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's supper. The second is that of the *Teachers*, who are set apart for the purposes of public instruction, and the celebration of divine worship. The third comprehends the *Deacons*, who are chosen out of both sexes. These three orders compose the consistory or council by which the church is governed. All matters of importance are proposed, examined, and decided in the meetings of the Brethren. The ministers are elected to their holy office by *their* suffrages, and are all, the *Deacons* excepted, installed by public prayers, attended with imposition of hands.

The Uckewal-
lists.

V. Among the inferior sects of the rigid Anabaptists, the most considerable is that which passes under the denomination of *Uckewallists*, and is so called after its founder UKE WALLS, a native of *Friesland*. This rustic, rigid, and ignorant sectary, not only exhorted his followers to maintain the primitive and austere doctrine of MENNO, without suffering it to be softened or altered in the smallest degree, but also took it into his head to propagate, jointly with another innovator, named JOHN LEUS, in the year 1637, a singular opinion concerning the salvation of JUDAS, and the rest of CHRIST's murderers. To give an air of plausibility to the favourable opinion he entertained concerning the eternal state of this arch-apostate, he invented the following odd hypothesis, "That the period of time that extended from "the birth of CHRIST to the descent of the Holy Ghost, and was, as it "were, the distinctive term that separated the Jewish from the Christian "dispensation, was a time of deep ignorance and darkness, during which "the Jews were void of light and entirely destitute of divine succour; and "that, of consequence, the sins and enormities, that were committed during "this interval, were in a great measure excusable, and could not merit the "severest displays of the divine justice." This idle fiction met with no indulgence either from the Mennonites on the one hand, or from the magistrates of Groningen on the other; for the former excluded its inventor from their communion, and the latter banished him from their city. He fixed his residence in the adjacent province of *East-Friesland*, and there drew after him a considerable number of disciples, whose descendants still subsist in the neighbourhood of *Groningen*, *Friesland*, and also in *Lithuania* and *Prussia*, and have their own religious assemblies, separate from those of the other Mennonites. As they have little intercourse with any but those of their own communion, it is not an easy matter to know, with certainty, whether they persevere in the singular opinion, that proved so detrimental to the interest of their leader. It is at least certain, that they follow scrupulously the steps of their original founder MENNO, and exhibit a lively image of the primitive manners and constitution of the Mennonites. They re-baptize all those who leave other Christian churches to embrace their communion. Their apparel is mean beyond expression, and they avoid every thing that has the most distant appearance of elegance or ornament.

They

They let their beards grow to an enormous length; their hair, uncombed, CENT. XVII. lies in a disorderly manner on their shoulders; their countenances are marked with the strongest lines of dejection and melancholy; and their habitations and household furniture are such as are only fitted to answer the demands of mere necessity. Such, moreover, is the severity of their discipline, that any member of their community, who departs, in the smallest instance, from this austere rule, is immediately excluded from the society, and avoided by all the Brethren, as a public pest. Their inspectors or bishops, whom they distinguished from the ministers, whose office is to preach and instruct, are chosen by an assembly composed of all the congregations of the sect. The ceremony of washing the feet of strangers, who come within the reach of their hospitality, is looked upon by them as a rite of divine institution. We shall not enlarge upon the other circumstances of their ritual, but only observe, that they prevent all attempts to alter or modify their religious discipline, by preserving their people from every thing that bears the remotest aspect of learning and science; from whatever, in a word, might have a tendency to enlighten their pious ignorance.

VI. The more moderate, who are called the *Grosser*, or less scrupulous Anabaptists, are composed of certain inhabitants of *Waterland*, *Flanders*, *Friesland*, and *Germany*, who entered into an association, as has been already observed, and commonly pass under the denomination of *Waterlandians*. The Waterlandians. This community has abandoned the severe discipline and singular opinions of MENNO, whom, nevertheless, they generally respect as their primitive parent and founder, and have advanced a step nearer than the other Anabaptists to the religious doctrines and customs of other Christian churches. They are, however, divided into two distinct sects, which bear the respective denominations of *Frieslanders* and *Waterlandians*, and are both without bishops, employing no other ecclesiastical ministers than *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. Each congregation of this sect is independent on all foreign jurisdiction, having its own ecclesiastical council or consistory, which is composed of *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. The supreme spiritual power is, nevertheless, in the hands of the people, without whose consent nothing of importance can be carried into execution. Their *Presbyters* are, generally speaking, men of learning, and apply themselves with success to the study of physic and philosophy. And there is a public professor supported, at present, by the sect at *Amsterdam*, for the instruction of their youth in the various branches of philosophy and sacred erudition.

VII. One of these Waterlandian sects was divided, in the year 1664, The Galenists and Apostoolians. into two factions, of which the one were called *Galenists*, and the other *Apostoolians*, from their respective leaders. The founder of the former was GALEN ABRAHAM HAAN, a doctor of physic, and pastor of a Mennonite congregation at *Amsterdam*, who has received the applause even of his enemies, on account of his uncommon penetration and eloquence. This eminent Anabaptist, in imitation of the Arminians, considered the Christian religion as a system, that laid much less stress upon faith than upon practice; and he was for receiving into the communion of the Mennonites

CENT. XVII. all those, who acknowledged the divine origin of the books of the Old and New Testament, and led holy and virtuous lives. Such, in his judgment, were true Christians, and had an undoubted right to all the rights and privileges that belong to that character. These comprehensive terms of communion were peculiarly favourable to his own theological sentiments, since his notions concerning CHRIST's divinity, and the salvation of mankind by his death and merits were, very different from those of the Mennonites, and coincided, a good deal, with the Socinian system.

Several persons opposed the sentiments of this Latitudinarian, and more especially SAMUEL APOSTOOL, an eminent pastor among the Mennonites at *Amsterdam*, who not only defended with the utmost zeal the doctrine generally received among the Mennonites, in relation to the divinity of CHRIST and the fruits of his death, but also maintained that ancient hypothesis of a visible and glorious church of CHRIST upon earth, that was peculiar to this sect [k]. Thus a controversy was kindled, which produced the division now mentioned; a division which the zealous efforts of several of the wisest and most respectable members of this community has hitherto proved insufficient to heal. The GALENISTS are not less disposed than the Arminians to admit, as members of their community, all those who call themselves Christians; and they are the only sect of the Anabaptists who reject the denomination of Mennonites. The *Apostoolians*, on the contrary, admit to their communion those only who profess to believe all the points of doctrine, which are contained in their public confession of faith [l].

CHAP. VI.

Concerning the SOCINIANS and ARIANS.

The flourishing
state of the So-
cinians.

I. ABOUT the commencement of this century the sect of the Socinians seemed to be well established, and their affairs were even in a flourishing situation. In *Transilvania* and *Lucko* they enjoyed the liberty of holding, without molestation, their religious assemblies, and professing publicly their theological opinions. The advantages, that attended their situation in *Poland*, were still more considerable; for they had, at *Racow*, a public seminary of learning, which was furnished with professors eminently distinguished by their erudition and genius, together with a press for the publication of their writings; they had also a considerable number of congregations in that district, and were supported by the patronage of several persons of the highest distinction. Elated with this scene of prosperity, they began to form more extensive views, and aimed at enlarging the borders of their community and procuring it patrons and protectors in other countries.

[k] For a more particular account of these two Mennonites, see SCHYN's *Deductio plenior Histor. Mennonit.* cap. xv. p. 318. and xviii. p. 237.

[l] CASP. COMMELINI *Descriptio Urbis Amstelodami*, tom. i. p. 500.—STOUPA's *Religion des Hollandois*, p. 20.—BENTHEM's *Hollandischer Schul- und Kirchen-Staat*, p. i. ch. xix. p. 830.

There

There are, in being, authentic records, from which it appears, that they sent emissaries with this view, about the commencement of this century, into *Holland, England, Germany, and Prussia*, who endeavoured to make profelytes to Socinianism in these countries among men of learning and men in power. For it is remarkable, that the Socinians, in propagating their religious principles, have always followed a quite different method from that which has been observed by other sects. It has been the general practice of sectaries and innovators to endeavour to render themselves popular, and to begin by gaining the multitude to their side; but the disciples of SocINUS, who are perpetually exalting the dignity, prerogatives, and authority of reason, have this peculiarity in their manner of proceeding, that they are at very little pains to court the favour of the people, or to make profelytes to their cause among those who are not distinguished from the multitude by their rank or their abilities. It is only among the learned and the great that they seek for disciples and patrons with a zealous assiduity.

II. The effect of the missions now mentioned, though they were conducted and executed by persons of whom the greatest part were eminent both on account of their rank and abilities, was, nevertheless, far from answering the views and expectations of the community. In most places, their success was doubtful; at best, but inconsiderable; in some, however, they were favourably received, and seemed to employ their labours to purpose. They had no where a more flattering prospect of success than in the academy of *Altorf*, where their sentiments and their cause were promoted with dexterity by ERNEST SOHNER, an acute and learned peripatetician, who was professor of physic and natural philosophy. This subtle philosopher, who had joined the Socinians during his residence in *Holland*, instilled their principles into the minds of his scholars with much greater facility, by his having acquired the highest reputation both for learning and piety. The death, indeed, of this eminent man, which happened in the year 1612, deprived the rising society of its chief ornament and support; nor could the remaining friends of Socinianism carry on the cause of their community with such art and dexterity, as to escape the vigilant and severe eye of the other professors. Their secret designs were accordingly brought to light, in the year 1616; and the contagion of Socinianism, which was gathering strength from day to day, and growing imperceptibly into a reigning system, was, all of a sudden, dissipated and extinguished by the vigilant severity of the magistrates of *Nuremberg*. The foreign students, who had been infected with these doctrines, saved themselves by flight, while the natives, who were chargeable with the same reproach, accepted of the remedies that were presented to them by the healing hand of orthodoxy, and returned quietly to their former theological system [m].

The progress and decline of Socinianism at *Altorf*.

[m] The learned GUSTAVUS GEORGE ZELTNER, formerly professor of divinity in the academy of *Altorf*, composed an ample and learned account of this theological revolution, drawn principally from manuscript-records, which was published at *Leipsic*, in the year 1729, in two volumes, in 4^{to}. by GEBAUER, under the following title: *Historia Crypto-Socinianismi, Altorfinæ quondam Academiæ infestæ, Arcana*.

CENT. XVII. all those, who acknowledged the divine origin of the books of the Old and New Testament, and led holy and virtuous lives. Such, in his judgment, were true Christians, and had an undoubted right to all the rights and privileges that belong to that character. These comprehensive terms of communion were peculiarly favourable to his own theological sentiments, since his notions concerning CHRIST's divinity, and the salvation of mankind by his death and merits were, very different from those of the Mennonites, and coincided, a good deal, with the Socinian system.

Several persons opposed the sentiments of this Latitudinarian, and more especially SAMUEL APOSTOOL, an eminent pastor among the Mennonites at *Amsterdam*, who not only defended with the utmost zeal the doctrine generally received among the Mennonites, in relation to the divinity of CHRIST and the fruits of his death, but also maintained that ancient hypothesis of a visible and glorious church of CHRIST upon earth, that was peculiar to this sect [k]. Thus a controversy was kindled, which produced the division now mentioned; a division which the zealous efforts of several of the wisest and most respective members of this community has hitherto proved insufficient to heal. The GALENISTS are not less disposed than the Arminians to admit, as members of their community, all those who call themselves Christians; and they are the only sect of the Anabaptists who reject the denomination of Mennonites. The *Apostoolians*, on the contrary, admit to their communion those only who profess to believe all the points of doctrine, which are contained in their public confession of faith [l].

CHAP. VI.

Concerning the SOCINIANS and ARIANS.

The flourishing
state of the So-
cinians.

I. ABOUT the commencement of this century the sect of the Socinians seemed to be well established, and their affairs were even in a flourishing situation. In *Transylvania* and *Lucko* they enjoyed the liberty of holding, without molestation, their religious assemblies, and professing publicly their theological opinions. The advantages, that attended their situation in *Poland*, were still more considerable; for they had, at *Racow*, a public seminary of learning, which was furnished with professors eminently distinguished by their erudition and genius, together with a press for the publication of their writings; they had also a considerable number of congregations in that district, and were supported by the patronage of several persons of the highest distinction. Elated with this scene of prosperity, they began to form more extensive views, and aimed at enlarging the borders of their community and procuring it patrons and protectors in other countries.

[k] For a more particular account of these two Mennonites, see SCHYN's *Deductio plenior Histor. Mennonit.* cap. xv. p. 318. and xviii. p. 237.

[l] CASP. COMMELINI *Descriptio Urbis Amstelodami*, tom. i. p. 500.—STOUPA's *Religion des Hollandois*, p. 20.—BENTHEM's *Hollandischer Schul-und Kirchen-Staat*, p. i. ch. xix. p. 830.

There

There are, in being, authentic records, from which it appears, that they sent emissaries with this view, about the commencement of this century, into *Holland, England, Germany, and Prussia*, who endeavoured to make profelytes to Socinianism in these countries among men of learning and men in power. For it is remarkable, that the Socinians, in propagating their religious principles, have always followed a quite different method from that which has been observed by other sects. It has been the general practice of sectaries and innovators to endeavour to render themselves popular, and to begin by gaining the multitude to their side; but the disciples of SocINUS, who are perpetually exalting the dignity, prerogatives, and authority of reason, have this peculiarity in their manner of proceeding, that they are at very little pains to court the favour of the people, or to make profelytes to their cause among those who are not distinguished from the multitude by their rank or their abilities. It is only among the learned and the great that they seek for disciples and patrons with a zealous assiduity.

II. The effect of the missions now mentioned, though they were conducted and executed by persons of whom the greatest part were eminent both on account of their rank and abilities, was, nevertheless, far from answering the views and expectations of the community. In most places, their success was doubtful; at best, but inconsiderable; in some, however, they were favourably received, and seemed to employ their labours to purpose. They had no where a more flattering prospect of success than in the academy of *Altorf*, where their sentiments and their cause were promoted with dexterity by ERNEST SOHNER, an acute and learned peripatetician, who was professor of physic and natural philosophy. This subtle philosopher, who had joined the Socinians during his residence in *Holland*, instilled their principles into the minds of his scholars with much greater facility, by his having acquired the highest reputation both for learning and piety. The death, indeed, of this eminent man, which happened in the year 1612, deprived the rising society of its chief ornament and support; nor could the remaining friends of Socinianism carry on the cause of their community with such art and dexterity, as to escape the vigilant and severe eye of the other professors. Their secret designs were accordingly brought to light, in the year 1616; and the contagion of Socinianism, which was gathering strength from day to day, and growing imperceptibly into a reigning system, was, all of a sudden, dissipated and extinguished by the vigilant severity of the magistrates of *Nuremberg*. The foreign students, who had been infected with these doctrines, saved themselves by flight, while the natives, who were chargeable with the same reproach, accepted of the remedies that were presented to them by the healing hand of orthodoxy, and returned quietly to their former theological system [m].

The progress and decline of Socinianism at *Altorf*.

[m] The learned GUSTAVUS GEORGE ZELTNER, formerly professor of divinity in the academy of *Altorf*, composed an ample and learned account of this theological revolution, drawn principally from manuscript-records, which was published at *Leipsic*, in the year 1729, in two volumes, in 4^{to}. by GEBAUER, under the following title: *Historia Crypto-Socinianismi, Altorfinæ quondam Academiæ infestæ, Arcana*.

CENT. XVII.

The decline of
Socinianism, and
the sufferings of
its votaries in
Poland.

III. The establishment of the Socinians in *Poland*, though it seemed to rest upon solid foundations, was nevertheless of a short duration [n]. Its chief supports were withdrawn, in the year 1638, by a public decree of the diet. It happened in this year that some of the students of *Racow* vented, in an irregular and tumultuous manner, their religious resentment against a crucifix, at which they threw stones till they bent it down out of its place. This act of violence excited such a high degree of indignation in the Roman-catholics, that they vowed revenge, and fulfilled this vow in the severest manner; for it was through their importunate solicitations that the terrible law was enacted at *Warsaw*, by which it was resolved, that the academy of *Racow* should be demolished, its professors banished with ignominy, the printing-house of the Socinians destroyed, and their churches shut. All this was executed without the smallest alleviation or the least delay, notwithstanding the efforts made by the powerful patrons of the Socinians to ward off the blow [o]. But a catastrophe, still more terrible, awaited them; and the persecution, now mentioned, was the fore-runner of that dreadful revolution, which, about twenty years afterwards, brought on the entire ruin of this community in *Poland*. For by a public and solemn act of the diet held at *Warsaw*, in the year 1658, all the Socinians were banished for ever from the territory of that republic, and capital punishment was denounced against all those who should either profess their opinions or harbour their persons. The unhappy exiles were, at first, allowed the space of three years to settle their affairs, and to dispose of their possessions; but this term was afterwards abridged by the cruelty of their enemies, and reduced to two years. In the year 1661, the terrible edict was renewed; and all the Socinians, that yet remained in *Poland*, were barbarously driven out of that country, some with the loss of their goods, others with the loss of their lives, as neither sickness, nor any domestic consideration, could suspend the execution of that rigorous sentence [p].

The fate of the
Socinian exiles.

IV. A part of these exiles, who sought for a refuge among their Brethren in *Transylvania*, sunk under the burthen of their calamities, and perished amidst the hardships to which they were exposed. A considerable number of these unhappy emigrants were dispersed through the adjacent provinces of *Silesia*, *Brandenburg*, and *Prussia*; and their posterity still subsists in those countries. Several of the more eminent members of the sect, in consequence of the protection granted them by the duke of BRIEG, resided for

[n] We have a circumstantial account of the flourishing state of the Racovian academy, while it was under the direction of the learned MARTIN RUARUS, in the *Cimbria Litterata* of MOLLERUS, tom. i. p. 572, where we learn that RUARUS was a native of *Holstein*, who became a profelyte to the Socinian system.

[o] *Epistola de WISSOWATII vita in SANDII Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar.* p. 233.—GUST. GEORG. RELTNERI *Historia Crypto-Socinianismi Altorffini*, vol. i. p. 299.

[p] STANISLAI LUBIENIECII *Historia Reformat. Polonica*, lib. iii. c. xvii, xviii. p. 279.—*Equitis Poloni Vindiciæ pro Unitariorum in Polonia Religionis libertate apud SANDIUM*, in *Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar.* p. 267.

some time at *Crossen* in *Silesia* [q]. Others went, in search of a convenient settlement for themselves and their brethren, into *Holland*, *England*, *Holstein*, and *Denmark*. Of all the Socinian exiles, none discovered such zeal and industry for the interests and establishment of the sect as STANISLAUS LUBIENIECIUS, a Polish knight, distinguished by his learning, and singularly esteemed by persons of the highest rank, and even by several sovereign princes, on account of his eloquence, politeness, and prudence. This illustrious patron of Socinianism succeeded so far in his designs, as to gain the favour of FREDERIC III, king of *Denmark*; CHRISTIAN ALBERT, duke of *Holstein*; and CHARLES LEWIS, elector *Palatine*; and thus had almost obtained a secure retreat and settlement for the Socinians, about the year 1662, at *Altena*, *Frederickstadt*, and *Manheim*; but his measures were disconcerted, and all his hopes entirely frustrated, by the opposition and remonstrances of the clergy established in these countries; he was opposed in *Denmark* by SUANINGIUS bishop of *Zealand*, in *Holstein* by REINBOTH, and in the *Palatinate* by JOHN LEWIS FABRICIUS [r]. Several other attempts were made, in different countries, in favour of Socinianism; but their success was still less considerable; nor could any of the European nations be persuaded to grant a public settlement to a sect, whose members denied the divinity of CHRIST.

V. The remains, therefore, of this unfortunate community are, at this day, dispersed through different countries, particularly in the kingdoms of *England* and *Prussia*, the electorate of *Brandenburg*, and the United Provinces, where they lie more or less concealed, and hold their religious assemblies in a clandestine manner. They are, indeed, said to exercise their religion publicly in *England*, not in consequence of a legal toleration, but through the indulgent connivance of the civil magistrate [s]. Some of them have embraced the communion of the Arminians; others have joined with that sect of the Anabaptists that are distinguished by the name of *Galenists*; and in this there is nothing at all surprizing, since neither the Arminians nor Anabaptists require from those, that enter into their communion, an explicit or circumstantial declaration of their religious sentiments. It is also said, that a considerable number of this dispersed community became members of

[q] LUBIENIECII *Historia Reformat. Polon.* cap. xviii. p. 285. where there is a letter written by the Socinians of *Crossen*.

[r] See SANDII *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitar.* p. 165.—*Historia Vitæ* LUBIENIECII, prefixed to his *Historia Reformationis Polonicæ*, p. 7, 8.—MOLLERI *Introductio in Histor. Chersones. Cimbrica*, p. ii. p. 105. and his *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 487.—JO. HENR. HEIDEGGERI *Vita* JOH. LUD. FABRICII, subjoined to the works of the latter, p. 38.

[s] The Socinians, who reside at present in the district of *Mark*, used to meet, some years ago, at stated times, at *Konigswald*, a village in the neighbourhood of *Frankfort* on the *Oder*. See the *Recueil de Litterature de Philosophie et d'Histoire* (published at *Amsterdam*, in the year 1731, in 8^{vo}*) p. 44.—They published, in the year 1716, at *Berlin*, their Confession of Faith in the German language, which is to be found, with a refutation thereto annexed, in a book, entitled, *Den Theologischen Heb-Opfern*, part. x. p. 852.

[* The author of this collection was one JORDAN, who was pastor of a church in the neighbourhood of *Berlin*.]

CENT. XVII. the religious society called *Collegiants* [t]. Amidst these perpetual changes and vicissitudes it was not possible, that the Socinians could maintain an uniform system of doctrine, or preserve unaltered and entire the religious tenets handed down to them by their ancestors. On the contrary, their peculiar and distinctive opinions are variously explained and understood both by the learned and illiterate members of their community, though they all agree in rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity, and that also of the *divinity* and *satisfaction* of JESUS CHRIST [u].

Arians.

VI. After the Socinians, as there is a great affinity between the two sects, it is proper to mention the Arians, who had several celebrated writers in this century, such as SANDIUS and BIDDLE [w]. Of those also, who passed under the general denomination of *Anti-Trinitarians* and *Unitarians*, there are many that may be placed in the class of the Socinians or Arians. For the term *Unitarian* is very comprehensive, and is applicable to a great variety of persons, who, notwithstanding, agree in this common principle, that *there is no real distinction in the divine nature*. The denomination of Arian is also given in general to all those, who consider JESUS CHRIST as *inferior* and *subordinate* to the Father. But, as this subordination may be understood and explained in a variety of ways, it is evident, that the term *Arian*, as it is used in modern language, is susceptible of different significations, and that, of consequence, the persons to whom it is applied cannot be all considered in the same point of light with the ancient Arians, nor supposed to agree perfectly with each other in their religious tenets.

CHAP. VII.

Concerning some sects of Inferior Note.

The Collegiants
or Rhinsbergers.

I. IT will not be amiss to take notice here of a few sects, of inferior consequence and note, which we could not mention with propriety in the history of the larger and more extensive communities, that we have been passing in review, and which, nevertheless, we cannot omit, for several rea-

[t] This community, of which there is an account given in the beginning of the following chapter, called their Religious Meetings, *Collegies*, a Dutch word, which signifies congregation or assembly, and hence they were denominated *Collegiants*.]

[u] Many examples might be alledged in proof of this; it will be sufficient to mention that of the learned CRELLIUS, who, though he was professor of theology among the Socinians, yet differed in his opinions, about many points of doctrine, from the sentiments of SOCINUS and the Racovian Catechism, and would not be called a Socinian, but an *Artemonite* *. See the *Journal Litteraire*, tom. xvii. p. i. p. 150. and the account I have given of this celebrated man in my *Syntagm. Dissertationum ad sanctiores Disciplinas pertinentium*, p. 352.—*Unschuld. Nachricht.* 1750, p. 942.—*Nouveau Diction. Historique et Critique*, tom. ii. p. ii. p. 88. [This last citation is erroneous; there is no account of CRELLIUS in the place here referred to.]

[w] For an account of SANDIUS, father and son, see ARNOLD and other writers. The Life of BIDDLE is to be found in the *Nouveau Diction. Historique et Critique*, tom. i. p. ii. p. 288.

[* After ARTEMON, who lived under the reign of the Emperor SEVERUS, and denied the pre-existence and divinity of JESUS CHRIST.]

sons.

sons. While the disputes and tumults, that the Arminian system produced in *Holland*, in the year 1619, were at the greatest height, then arose that religious society, whose members hold at *Rhinberg*, in the neighbourhood of *Leyden*, a solemn assembly every half year, and are generally known under the denomination of *Collegiants* [x]. This community was founded by three brothers, whose name was VANDER KODDE, who passed their days in the obscurity of a rural life, but are said to have been men of eminent piety, well acquainted with sacred literature, and great enemies to religious controversy. They had for their associate ANTHONY CORNELIUS, a man also of a mean condition, and who had no qualities that could give any degree of weight or credit to their cause. The descendants and followers of these men acquired the name of *Collegiants*, from this particular circumstance, that they called their religious assemblies, *Colleges*. All are admitted to the communion of this sect, who acknowledge the divinity of the holy Scriptures, and endeavour to live suitably to their precepts and doctrines, whatever their peculiar sentiments may be concerning the nature of the Deity, and the truths of Christianity. Their numbers are very considerable in the provinces of *Holland*, *Utrecht*, *Friesland*, and *Westfriesland*. They meet twice every week, even on Sundays and Wednesdays, for the purposes of divine worship; and after singing a psalm or hymn, and addressing themselves to the Deity by prayer, they explain a certain portion of the New Testament. The female members of the community are not allowed to speak in public; but all others, without any exception founded on rank, condition, or incapacity, have a right to communicate the result of their meditations to the assembly, and to submit their sentiments to the judgment of the Brethren. All likewise have an unquestionable right to examine and oppose what any of the Brethren has advanced, provided their opposition be attended with a spirit of Christian charity and moderation. There is a printed list of the passages of Scripture, that are to be examined and illustrated at each of their religious meetings; so that any one, who is ambitious of appearing among the *speakers*, may study the subject before hand, and thus come fully prepared to descant upon it in public. The Brethren, as has been already observed, have a general assembly twice a year at *Rhinberg*, where they have ample and convenient houses for the education of orphans and the reception of strangers; and there they remain together during the space of four days, which are employed in hearing discourses that tend to edification, and exhortations that are principally designed to inculcate brotherly love and sanctity of manners. The sacrament of the Lord's supper is also administered, during this assembly; and those adult persons, that desire to be baptized, receive the sacrament of Baptism, according to the ancient and primitive manner of celebrating that institution, even by immersion. Those of the Brethren, that reside in the province of *Friesland*, have at present an annual meeting at *Lewarden*, where they administer the sacraments, as the considerable distance at which they live from *Rhinberg*, renders it inconvenient for them to repair thither twice a

[x] See above, note [u].

CENT. XVII year. We shall conclude our account of the *Collegiants* by observing, that their community is of a most ample and extensive kind; that it comprehends persons of all ranks, orders, and sects, who profess themselves Christians, though their sentiments concerning the person and doctrine of the divine founder of Christianity be extremely different; that it is kept together and its union maintained, not by the authority of rulers and doctors, the force of ecclesiastical laws, the restraining power of creeds and confessions, or the influence of certain positive rites and institutions, but merely by a zeal for the advancement of practical religion, and a desire of drawing instruction from the study of the holy Scriptures [y].

II. In such a community, or rather amidst such a multitude, as this, in which *opinion* is free, and every one is permitted to judge for himself in religious matters, dissensions and controversies can scarcely have place. However, a debate attended with some warmth arose, in the year 1672, between JOHN and PAUL BREDENBURG, merchants of *Rotterdam*, on the one side, and ABRAHAM LEMMERMAN and FRANCIS CUIPER, merchants of *Amsterdam*, on the other. JOHN BREDENBURG had erected a particular society or *college*, in which he gave a course of lectures upon the religion of nature and reason; but this undertaking was highly disapproved of by LEMMERMAN and CUIPER, who were for excluding reason altogether from religious inquiries and pursuits. During the heat of this controversy, BREDENBURG discovered a manifest propensity towards the sentiments of SPINOZA; nay, he even defended them publicly, and yet, at the same time, professed a firm attachment to the Christian religion [z]. Other debates of

[y] See the *Dissertation sur les usages de ceux qu'on appelle en Hollande Collegiens et Rhinobourgeois*, in the *Ceremonies Religieuses de tous les Peuples du monde*, tom. iv. p. 323.—as also a Dutch book containing an account of the *Collegiants*, and published by themselves under the following title: *De Oerspronck, Natuur, Handelwyze en Oogmerk der zo genaamde Rynburgsche Vergadering*, at *Amsterdam* in 4^{to}. in the year 1736.

[z] The names of JOHN BREDENBURG and FRANCIS CUIPER are well known among the followers and adversaries of SPINOZA; but the character and profession of these two disputants are less generally known. BREDENBURG, or (as he is otherwise called) BREITENBURG, was a *Collegiant*, and a merchant of *Rotterdam*, who propagated, in a public manner, the doctrine of SPINOZA, and pretended to demonstrate mathematically its conformity to the dictates of reason. The same man not only professed Christianity, but moreover explained, recommended, and maintained the Christian religion in the meetings of the *Collegiants*, and asserted, on all occasions, its divine original. To reconcile these striking contradictions, he declared, on the one hand, that *reason* and *Christianity* were in direct opposition to each other; but maintained, on the other, that we were obliged to believe, even against the evidence of the strongest mathematical demonstrations, the religious doctrines comprehended in the holy Scriptures (this, indeed, was adding absurdity to absurdity). He affirmed, that *truth* was twofold, *theological* and *philosophical*; and that those propositions, which were false in theology, were true in philosophy. There is a brief, but accurate, account of the character and sentiments of BREDENBURG, in the learned work of the Jew, ISAAC OROBIO, entitled, *Certamen Philosophicum propugnatae veritatis divinæ et naturalis adversus Jo. BREDENBURGII principia, ex quibus, quod religio rationi repugnat, demonstrare nititur*. This work, which contains BREDENBURG's pretended demonstrations of the philosophy of SPINOZA, was first published in 8^{vo} at *Amsterdam*, in the year 1703, and afterwards in 12^{mo} at *Brussels*, in 1731. FRANCIS CUIPER, who was the antagonist of BREDENBURG, acquired a considerable reputation by his *Arcana Atheismi detecta*, i. e. *The secrets of Atheism detected*. He was a bookseller at *Amsterdam*, and it was he that published, among other things, the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum seu Unitariorum*. Those, who have a tolerable acquaintance with the literary history of this century,

less

less consequence arose in this community, and the effect of those dissensions was a division of the *Collegiants* into two parties, who held their assemblies separately at *Rhinberg*. This division happened in the year 1686, but it was healed, about the commencement of the present century, by the death of those who had principally occasioned it; and then the *Collegiants* returned to their former union and concord [a].

III. The sect of the *Labadists* were so called from their founder JOHN LABADIE, a native of *France*, a man of no mean genius, and remarkable for a natural and masculine eloquence. This man was born in the Romish communion, entered into the order of the Jesuits; and, being dismissed by them [b], became a member of the Reformed church, and performed, with reputation, the ministerial functions in *France*, *Switzerland*, and *Holland*. He at length erected a new community, which resided successively at *Middeburg* in *Zeland* and at *Amsterdam*. In the year 1670, it was transplanted to *Hervorden*, a town in *Westphalia*, at the particular desire of the Princess ELIZABETH, daughter of the elector *Palatine*, and abbess of *Hervorden* [c]. It was nevertheless driven from thence, notwithstanding the protection of this illustrious princess; and, in the year 1672, settled at *Altena*, where its founder died two years after his arrival. After the death of LABADIE, his followers removed their wandering community to *Wiewert*, in the district of *North-Holland*, where it found a peaceful retreat, and soon fell into oblivion; so that few, if any traces of it, are now to be found.

The Labadists.

Among the persons that became members of this sect, there were some, whose learning and abilities gave it a certain degree of credit and reputation,

know that CUIPER, on account of the very book which he wrote against BREDENBURG, was suspected of Spinozism, though he was a *Collegiant*, and a zealous defender of the Christian faith, as also of the perfect conformity that there is between right reason and true religion. [Dr. MOSHEIM said a little before in the text, that LEMMERMAN and CUIPER were for excluding reason altogether from religion; how then can he consistently say here of the latter, that he was a defender of the conformity, that there is between reason and religion?]

[a] Besides the authors who have been already mentioned, those, who understand the German language, may consult the curious work of SIMON FREDERIC RUES, entitled, *Nachrichten vom Zustande der Mennoniten*, p. 267.

[(b) From this expression of our author, some may be led to imagine, that LABADIE was expelled by the Jesuits from their society; and many have, in effect, entertained this notion. But this is a palpable mistake; and whoever will be at the pains of consulting the letter of the Abbé GOUJET to Father NICERON (published in the *Memoires des Hommes Illustres*, tom. xx. p. 142, 143) will find that LABADIE had long solicited his discharge from that society, and, after many refusals, obtained it at length in an honourable manner, by a public act signed at *Bordeaux*, by one of the provincials, the 17th of April, 1639. For a full account of this restless, turbulent, and visionary man, who, by his plans of reformation conducted by a zeal destitute of prudence, produced much tumult and disorder, both in the Romish and Reformed churches, see his *Life*, composed with learning, impartiality, and judgment, by the Reverend Mr. CHAUFFEPED, in his Supplement to BAYLE, entitled, *Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*.]

[(c) This illustrious princess seems to have had as prevailing a taste for fanaticism, as her grand-father King JAMES I of *England* had for scholastic theology. She carried on a correspondence with PENN, the famous Quaker, and other members of that extravagant sect. She is, nevertheless, celebrated by certain writers, on account of her application to the study of philosophy and poetry. That a poetical fancy may have rendered her susceptible of fanatical impressions, is not impossible; but how these impressions could be reconciled with a philosophical spirit, is more difficult to imagine.]

CENT. XVII. particularly ANNA MARIA SCHUURMAN, of *Utrecht*, whose extensive erudition rendered her so famous, in the republic of letters, during the last century. The members of this community, if we are to judge of them by their own account of things, did not differ from the Reformed church, so much in their tenets and doctrines, as in their manners and rules of discipline [d]. For their founder exhibited, in his own conduct, a most austere model of sanctity and obedience, which his disciples and followers were obliged to imitate; and they were taught to look for the *communion of saints*, not only in the invisible church, but in a *visible* one, which, according to their views of things, ought to be composed of none, but such persons as were distinguished by their sanctity and virtue, and by a pious progress towards perfection. There are still extant several treatises composed by LABBADIE, which sufficiently discover the temper and spirit of the man, and carry the evident marks of a lively and glowing imagination, that was not tempered by the influence of a sober and accurate judgment. And as persons of this character are sometimes carried, by the impetuosity of passion and the seduction of fancy, both into erroneous notions and licentious pursuits, we are not perhaps to reject, in consequence of an excessive charity, the testimonies of those, who have found many things worthy of censure both in the life and doctrine of this turbulent enthusiast [e].

[(d) LABBADIE always declared, that he embraced the doctrines of the Reformed church. Nevertheless, when he was called to perform the ministerial functions to a French church at *Middleburg* in *Zealand*, he refused to subscribe their confession of faith. Besides, if we examine his writings, we shall find, that he entertained very odd and singular opinions on various subjects. He maintained, among other things, "that God might, and did, on certain occasions, deceive men—" that the holy Scripture was not sufficient to lead men to salvation, without certain particular *illuminations* and *revelations* from the Holy Ghost—that in reading the Scriptures we ought to give "less attention to the literal sense of the words than to the inward suggestions of the spirit, and "that the efficacy of the word depended upon him that preached it—that the faithful ought to "have all things in common—that there is no subordination or distinction of rank in the true "church of CHRIST—that CHRIST was to reign a thousand years upon earth—that the *contemplative life* is a state of grace and union with God, and the very height of perfection—that "the Christian, whose mind is contented and calm, sees all things in God, enjoys the Deity, and "is perfectly indifferent about every thing that passes in the world—and that the Christian arrives at that happy state by the exercise of a perfect self-denial, by mortifying the flesh and all "sensual affections, and by mental prayer." Besides these, he had formed singular ideas of the Old and New Testament, considered as covenants, as also concerning the Sabbath and the true nature of a Christian church.

It is remarkable enough, that almost all the sectaries of an enthusiastical turn, were desirous of entering into communion with LABBADIE. The Brownists offered him their church at *Middelburg*, when he was suspended by the French synod from his pastoral functions. The Quakers sent their two leading members ROBERT BARCLAY and GEORGE KEITH to *Amsterdam*, while he resided there, to examine his doctrine; and, after several conferences with him, these two commissioners offered to receive him in their communion, which he refused, probably from a principle of ambition and the desire of remaining head of a sect. Nay, it is said, that the famous WILLIAM PENN made a second attempt to gain over the Labbadists, and that he went for that purpose to *Wiewert*, where they resided after the death of their founder; but without success. We do not pretend to answer for the certainty of these facts; but shall only observe, that they are related by MOLLERUS, in his *Cimbria Litterata*, on the authority of a Mss. Journal, of which several extracts have been given by JOACH. FRED. FELLER, in his *Trimest. ix Monumentorum ineditorum*. sect. iii. A 1717, p. 498—500.]

[e] See MOLLERUS's *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. iii. p. 35. & *Isagoge ad Hist. Chersenses*. IV. Among

IV. Among the fanatical contemporaries of LABBADIE, was the famous ANTOINETTE BOURIGNON DE LA PORTE, a native of *Flanders*, who pretended to be divinely inspired, and set apart, by a particular interposition of heaven, to revive the true spirit of Christianity, that had been extinguished by theological animosities and debates. This female enthusiast, whose religious feelings were accompanied with an unparalleled vivacity and ardor, and whose fancy was exuberant beyond all expression, joined to these qualities a volubility of tongue, less wonderful indeed, yet much adapted to seduce the unwary. Furnished with these useful talents, she began to propagate her theological system, and her enthusiastical notions made a great noise in *Flanders*, *Holland*, and some parts of *Germany*, where she had resided some years. Nor was it only the ignorant multitude that swallowed down with facility her visionary doctrines; since it is well known, that several learned and ingenious men were persuaded of their truth, and caught the contagion of her fanaticism. After experiencing various turns of fortune, and suffering much vexation and mockeries on account of her religious fancies, she ended her days at *Franeker*, in the province of *Friesland*, in the year 1680. Her writings were numerous; but it would be a fruitless attempt to endeavour to draw from them an accurate and consistent scheme of religion. For the pretended *divine light*, that guides people of this class, does not proceed in a methodical way of reasoning and argument; it discovers itself by flashes, which shed nothing but thick darkness in the minds of those who investigate truth with the understanding, and do not trust to the reports of fancy, that is so often governed by sense and passion. An attentive reader will, however, learn something by perusing the writings of this fanatical virgin; he will be persuaded, that her intellect must have been in a disordered state; that the greatest part of her *divine effusions* were borrowed from the productions of the Mystics; and that, by the intemperance of her imagination, she has given an additional air of extravagance and absurdity to the tenets she has derived from these pompous enthusiasts. If we attend to the main and predominant principle that reigns throughout the incoherent productions of BOURIGNON, we shall find it to be the following: *That the Christian religion neither consists in knowledge nor in practice, but in a certain internal feeling and divine impulse, that arises immediately from communion with the Deity* [f]. Among the more considerable patrons of this fanatical doctrine, we may reckon CHRISTIAN BARTHOLOMEW DE CORDT, a Jesuit, and priest of the oratory at *Mecklin*, who died at *Nordstrandt* in the dutchy of *Sleswick* [g]; and PETER POIRET, a man of a bold and penetrat-

CENT. XVII.
Bourignon and
Poiret.

Cimbricae, p. ii. cap. v. p. 121.—ARNOLD, *Histor. Ecclesiast.* vol. i. p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. xxi. p. 1186.—WEISMAN, *Hist. Eccles. Sæc. xvii.* p. 927.—For an account of the two famous companions of LABBADIE, viz. DU LIGNON and YVON, see MOLLERUS's *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 472. 1020.

[f] See, for an ample account of BOURIGNON, the following writers: MOLLER. *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 85.—*Introductio in Histor. Chersonesi Cimbricae*, p. ii. p. 151.—BAYLE's *Dictionaire*, tom. i. at the article BOURIGNON.—ARNOLD, *Historia Eccles. et Hæret.* vol. ii.

[g] MOLLER's *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 149.

ing

CENT. XVII. particularly ANNA MARIA SCHUURMAN, of *Utrecht*, whose extensive erudition rendered her so famous, in the republic of letters, during the last century. The members of this community, if we are to judge of them by their own account of things, did not differ from the Reformed church, so much in their tenets and doctrines, as in their manners and rules of discipline [d]. For their founder exhibited, in his own conduct, a most austere model of sanctity and obedience, which his disciples and followers were obliged to imitate; and they were taught to look for the *communion of saints*, not only in the invisible church, but in a *visible* one, which, according to their views of things, ought to be composed of none, but such persons as were distinguished by their sanctity and virtue, and by a pious progress towards perfection. There are still extant several treatises composed by LABBADIE, which sufficiently discover the temper and spirit of the man, and carry the evident marks of a lively and glowing imagination, that was not tempered by the influence of a sober and accurate judgment. And as persons of this character are sometimes carried, by the impetuosity of passion and the seduction of fancy, both into erroneous notions and licentious pursuits, we are not perhaps to reject, in consequence of an excessive charity, the testimonies of those, who have found many things worthy of censure both in the life and doctrine of this turbulent enthusiast [e].

[(d) LABBADIE always declared, that he embraced the doctrines of the Reformed church. Nevertheless, when he was called to perform the ministerial functions to a French church at *Middleburg* in *Zealand*, he refused to subscribe their confession of faith. Besides, if we examine his writings, we shall find, that he entertained very odd and singular opinions on various subjects. He maintained, among other things, "that God might, and did, on certain occasions, deceive men —" "that the holy Scripture was not sufficient to lead men to salvation, without certain particular *illuminations* and *revelations* from the Holy Ghost — that in reading the Scriptures we ought to give less attention to the literal sense of the words than to the inward suggestions of the spirit, and "that the efficacy of the word depended upon him that preached it — that the faithful ought to have all things in common — that there is no subordination or distinction of rank in the true church of CHRIST — that CHRIST was to reign a thousand years upon earth — that the *contemplative life* is a state of grace and union with God, and the very height of perfection — that the Christian, whose mind is contented and calm, sees all things in God, enjoys the Deity, and "is perfectly indifferent about every thing that passes in the world — and that the Christian arrives at that happy state by the exercise of a perfect self-denial, by mortifying the flesh and all sensual affections, and by mental prayer." Besides these, he had formed singular ideas of the Old and New Testament, considered as covenants, as also concerning the Sabbath and the true nature of a Christian church.

It is remarkable enough, that almost all the sectaries of an enthusiastical turn, were desirous of entering into communion with LABBADIE. The Brownists offered him their church at *Middelburg*, when he was suspended by the French synod from his pastoral functions. The Quakers sent their two leading members ROBERT BARCLAY and GEORGE KEITH to *Amsterdam*, while he resided there, to examine his doctrine; and, after several conferences with him, these two commissioners offered to receive him in their communion, which he refused, probably from a principle of ambition and the desire of remaining head of a sect. Nay, it is said, that the famous WILLIAM PENN made a second attempt to gain over the Labbadists, and that he went for that purpose to *Wiewert*, where they resided after the death of their founder; but without success. We do not pretend to answer for the certainty of these facts; but shall only observe, that they are related by MOLLERUS, in his *Cimbria Litterata*, on the authority of a Mss. Journal, of which several extracts have been given by JOACH. FRED. FELLER, in his *Trimest. ix Monumentorum ineditorum*. sect. iii. A 1717, p. 498—500.]

[e] See MOLLERUS's *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. iii. p. 35. & *Isagoge ad Histor. Chersones.* IV. Among

IV. Among the fanatical contemporaries of LABBADIE, was the famous ANTOINETTE BOURIGNON DE LA PORTE, a native of *Flanders*, who pretended to be divinely inspired, and set apart, by a particular interposition of heaven, to revive the true spirit of Christianity, that had been extinguished by theological animosities and debates. This female enthusiast, whose religious feelings were accompanied with an unparalleled vivacity and ardor, and whose fancy was exuberant beyond all expression, joined to these qualities a volubility of tongue, less wonderful indeed, yet much adapted to seduce the unwary. Furnished with these useful talents, she began to propagate her theological system, and her enthusiastical notions made a great noise in *Flanders*, *Holland*, and some parts of *Germany*, where she had resided some years. Nor was it only the ignorant multitude that swallowed down with facility her visionary doctrines; since it is well known, that several learned and ingenious men were persuaded of their truth, and caught the contagion of her fanaticism. After experiencing various turns of fortune, and suffering much vexation and mockeries on account of her religious fancies, she ended her days at *Franeker*, in the province of *Friesland*, in the year 1680. Her writings were numerous; but it would be a fruitless attempt to endeavour to draw from them an accurate and consistent scheme of religion. For the pretended *divine light*, that guides people of this class, does not proceed in a methodical way of reasoning and argument; it discovers itself by flashes, which shed nothing but thick darkness in the minds of those who investigate truth with the understanding, and do not trust to the reports of fancy, that is so often governed by sense and passion. An attentive reader will, however, learn something by perusing the writings of this fanatical virgin; he will be persuaded, that her intellect must have been in a disordered state; that the greatest part of her *divine effusions* were borrowed from the productions of the Mystics; and that, by the intemperance of her imagination, she has given an additional air of extravagance and absurdity to the tenets she has derived from these pompous enthusiasts. If we attend to the main and predominant principle that reigns throughout the incoherent productions of BOURIGNON, we shall find it to be the following: *That the Christian religion neither consists in knowledge nor in practice, but in a certain internal feeling and divine impulse, that arises immediately from communion with the Deity* [f]. Among the more considerable patrons of this fanatical doctrine, we may reckon CHRISTIAN BARTHOLOMEW DE CORDT, a Jansenist, and priest of the oratory at *Mecklin*, who died at *Nordstrandt* in the dutchy of *Sleswick* [g]; and PETER POIRET, a man of a bold and penetrat-

CENT. XVII.
Bourignon and
Poiret.

Cimbricæ, p. ii. cap. v. p. 121.—ARNOLD, *Histor. Ecclesiast.* vol. i. p. ii. lib. xvii. cap. xxi. p. 1186.—WEISMAN, *Hist. Eccles. Sæc. xvii.* p. 927.—For an account of the two famous companions of LABBADIE, viz. DU LIGNON and YVON, see MOLLERUS's *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 472. 1020.

[f] See, for an ample account of BOURIGNON, the following writers: MOLLER. *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 85.—*Introductio in Histor. Chersonesi Cimbricæ*, p. ii. p. 151.—BAYLE's *Dictionnaire*, tom. i. at the article BOURIGNON.—ARNOLD, *Historia Eccles. et Hæret.* vol. ii.

[g] MOLLER's *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 149.

ing

CENT. XVII. ing genius, who was a great master of the Cartesian philosophy [b]. This latter has shewn, in a striking manner, by his own example, that knowledge and ignorance, reason and superstition, are often divided by thin partitions; and that they sometimes not only dwell together in the same person, but also, by an unnatural and unaccountable union, lend each other mutual assistance, and thus engender monstrous productions.

The Philadel-
phian society.

V. The same spirit, the same views, and the same kind of religion that distinguished BOURIGNON, were observable in an English and also a female fanatic, named JANE LEADLEY, who, towards the conclusion of this century, seduced, by her visions, predictions, and doctrines, a considerable number of disciples, among whom there were some persons of learning; and thus gave rise to what was called, the *Philadelphian Society*. This woman was of opinion, that all dissensions among Christians would cease, and the kingdom of the Redeemer become, even here below, a glorious scene of charity, concord, and felicity, if those who bear the name of JESUS, without regarding the forms of doctrine or discipline that distinguish particular communions, would all join in committing their souls to the care of the *internal guide*, to be instructed, governed, and formed by his divine impulse and suggestions. Nay, she went still further, and declared, in the name of the Lord, that this desirable event would happen, and that she had a divine commission to proclaim the approach of this glorious communion of saints, who were to be gathered together in one visible universal church, or kingdom, before the dissolution of this earthly globe. This prediction she delivered with a peculiar degree of confidence from a notion, that her Philadelphian society was the true *kingdom of CHRIST*, in which alone the divine spirit resided and reigned. We shall not mention the other dreams of this enthusiast, among which the famous doctrine of the final restoration of all intelligent Beings to perfection and happiness held an eminent place. LEADLEY was less fortunate than BOURIGNON in this respect, that she had not such an eloquent and ingenious patron as POIRET, to plead her cause and to give an air of philosophy to her wild reveries. For PORDAGE and BROMLEY, who were the chief of her associates, had nothing to recommend them but their Mystic piety and contemplative turn of mind. PORDAGE more especially was so far destitute of the powers of elocution and reasoning, that he even surpassed JACOB BOEHMEN, whom he admired, in obscurity and nonsense, and, instead of imparting instruction to his readers, did no more than excite in them a stupid kind of awe by a high-sounding jingle of pompous words [i].

[b] POIRET dressed out in an artful manner, and reduced to a kind of system, the wild and incoherent fancies of BOURIGNON, in his large work, entitled, *L'Oeconomie Divine ou Systeme Universel*, which was published, both in French and Latin, at *Amsterdam*, in the year 1686, in seven volumes, 8°.—For an account of this Mystic philosopher, whose name and voluminous writings have made such a noise, see *Bibliotheca Brem. Theol. Philol.* tom. iii. p. i. p. 75.

[i] See JO. WOLFG. JAEGERI *Historia Sacra et Civilis, Sæc. xvii. Decenn. x.* p. 90.—PETRI POIRETI *Bibliotheca Mysticor.* p. 161. 174. 283. 286.

A
SHORT VIEW or GENERAL SKETCH
OF THE
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
OF THE
EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

I. **T**HE history of the Christian church, during the present age, instead of a few pages, would alone require a volume, such are the number and importance of the materials that it exhibits to an attentive inquirer. It is therefore to be hoped, that, in due time, some able and impartial writer will employ his labours on this interesting subject. At the same time, to render the present work as compleat as possible, and to give a certain clue to direct those who teach or who study ecclesiastical history, through a multitude of facts that have not yet been gathered together and digested into a regular order, we shall draw here a general sketch, that will exhibit the principal outlines of the state of religion since the commencement of the present century. That this sketch may not swell to too great a size, we shall omit the mention of the authors who have furnished materials for this period of church history. Those that are acquainted with modern literature must know, that there are innumerable productions extant, from whence such a variety of lines and colours might be taken, as would render this rough and general draught a compleat and finished piece.

CENT. XVIII.

Introductory
observation.

II. The doctrines of Christianity have been propagated in *Asia, Africa,* and *America*, with equal zeal, both by the Protestant and Popish missionaries. But we cannot say the same thing of the true spirit of the Gospel, or of the religious discipline and institutions that it recommends to the observance of Christians; for it is an undeniable fact, that many of those whom the Romish missionaries have persuaded to renounce their false Gods, are Christians only as far as an external profession and certain religious ceremonies go; and that, instead of departing from the superstitions of their ancestors, they observe them still, though under a different form. We have, indeed, pompous accounts of the mighty success with which the ministry of the Jesuits has been attended among the

Concerning the
prosperous state
of the church in
general, and of
the Romish
church in par-
ticular.

CENT. XVIII. the barbarous and unenlightened nations; and the French Jesuits in particular are said to have converted innumerable multitudes in the course of their missions. This perhaps cannot be altogether denied, if we are to call those, converts to Christianity, who have received some faint and superficial notions of the doctrines of the Gospel; for it is well known, that several congregations of *such* Christians have been formed by the Jesuits in the *East-Indies*, and more especially in the kingdoms of *Carnate*, *Madura*, and *Marava*, on the coast of *Malabar*, in the kingdom of *Tonquin*, the Chinese empire, and also in certain provinces of *America*. These conversions have, in outward appearances, been carried on with particular success, since ANTHONY VERI has had the direction of the foreign missions, and has taken such special care, that neither hands should be wanting for this spiritual harvest, nor any expences spared that might be necessary to the execution of such an arduous and important undertaking. But these pretended conversions, instead of effacing the infamy under which the Jesuits labour in consequence of the iniquitous conduct of their missionaries in former ages, have only served to augment it, and to shew their designs and practices in a still more odious point of light. For they are known to be much more zealous in satisfying the demands of their avarice and ambition, than in promoting the cause of CHRIST, and are said to corrupt and modify, by a variety of inventions, the pure doctrine of the Gospel, in order to render it more universally palatable, and to increase the number of their ambiguous converts.

The famous contest relating to the lawfulness of allowing the Chinese Christians to observe their ancient rites.

III. A famous question arose in this century, which made a great noise in the Romish church, relating to the conduct of the Jesuits in *China*, and their manner of promoting the cause of the Gospel by permitting the new converts to observe the religious rites and customs of their ancestors. This question was decided to the disadvantage of the missionaries, in the year 1704, by CLEMENT XI, who, by a solemn edict, forbade the Chinese Christians to practise the religious rites of their ancestors, and more especially those that are celebrated by the Chinese in honour of their deceased parents and of their great lawgiver CONFUCIUS. This severe edict was, nevertheless, considerably mitigated in the year 1715, in order to appease, no doubt, the resentment of the Jesuits, whom it exasperated in the highest degree. For the pontif allowed the missionaries to make use of the word TIEN, to express the *divine nature*, with the addition of the word TCHU, to remove its ambiguity, and make it evident, that it was not the *heaven*, but the *Lord of heaven*, that the Christian doctors worshiped [k]; he also permitted the observance of those rites and ceremonies that had so highly offended the adversaries of the Jesuits, on condition, that they should be considered merely as marks of respect to their parents, and as tokens of civil homage to their lawgivers, without being abused to the purposes of superstition, or even being viewed in a religious point of light. In consequence of this second papal edict, the Chinese converts to Christianity are allowed considerable liberties; among other things they have in their houses *tablets*, on which the names of their

[k] TIEN TCHU signifies the LORD OF HEAVEN.

ancestors, and particularly of CONFUCIUS, are written in golden letters; they are allowed to light candles before these tablets, to make offerings to them of rich perfumes, victuals, fruits, and other delicacies, nay, to prostrate the body before them until the head touches the ground. The same ceremony of prostration is performed by the Chinese Christians at the tombs of their ancestors.

The first of these papal edicts, which was designed to prevent the motley mixture of Chinese superstition with the religious institutions of Christianity, was brought to *China*, in the year 1705, by Cardinal TOURNON, the pope's legate; and the second, which was of a more indulgent nature, was sent, in the year 1721, with MEZZABARBA, who went to *China* with the same character. Neither the emperor nor the Jesuits were satisfied with these edicts. TOURNON, who executed the orders of his ghostly master with more zeal than prudence, was, by the express command of the emperor, thrown into prison, where he died in the year 1710. MEZZABARBA, though more cautious and prudent, yet returned home without having succeeded in his negotiation; nor could the emperor be engaged, by either arguments or intreaties, to make any alteration in the institutions and customs of his ancestors. At present, the state of Christianity in *China* being extremely precarious and uncertain, this famous controversy is entirely suspended, and many reasons induce us to think, that both the pontiffs and the enemies of the Jesuits will unite in permitting the latter to depart from the rigour of the papal edicts, and to follow their own artful and insinuating methods of conversion. For they will both esteem it expedient and lawful to submit to many inconveniencies and abuses, rather than to risk the entire suppression of popery in *China*.

IV. The attempts made, since the commencement of the present century, by the English and Dutch, and more especially by the former, to diffuse the light of Christianity through the benighted regions of *Asia* and *America*, have been carried on with more assiduity and zeal than in the preceding age. That the Lutherans have born their part in this salutary work appears abundantly from the Danish mission, planned with such piety, in the year 1706, by FREDERIC IV, for the conversion of the Indians that inhabit the coast of *Malabar*, and attended with such remarkable success. This noble establishment, which surpasses all that have been yet erected for the propagation of the Gospel, not only subsists still in a flourishing state, but acquires daily new degrees of perfection under the auspicious and munificent patronage of that excellent monarch CHRISTIAN VI. We will indeed readily grant, that the converts to Christianity, that are made by the Danish missionaries, are less numerous than those which we find in the lists of the Popish legates; but it may be affirmed, at the same time, that they are much better Christians, and far excel the latter in the sincerity and zeal that accompany their profession. There is a great difference between Christians in reality, and Christians in appearance; and it is very certain, that the Popish missionaries are much more ready than the Protestant doctors to

Protestant missions.

CENT. XVIII. admit into their communion profelytes, who have nothing of Christianity but the name.

We have but imperfect accounts of the labours of the Russian clergy, the greatest part of whom lie yet involved in that gross ignorance that covered the most unenlightened ages of the church. We learn, nevertheless, from the modern records of that nation, that some of their doctors have employed, with a certain degree of success, their zeal and industry in spreading the light of the Gospel in those provinces that lie in the neighbourhood of *Siberia*.

Private enemies
of the Gospel.

V. While the missionaries now mentioned exposed themselves to the greatest dangers and sufferings in order to diffuse the light of divine truth in these remote and darkened nations, there arose in *Europe*, where the Gospel had obtained a stable footing, a multitude of adversaries, who shut their eyes upon its excellence and endeavoured to eclipse its immortal lustre. There is no country in *Europe*, where infidelity has not exhaled its poison; and scarcely any denomination of Christians among whom we may not find several persons, who either aim at the total extinction of all religion, or at least endeavour to invalidate the authority of the Christian system. Some carry on these unhappy attempts in an open manner, others under the mask of a Christian profession; but no where have these enemies of the purest religion, and consequently of mankind whom it was designed to render wise and happy, appeared with more effrontery and insolence than under the free governments of *Great-Britain* and the United Provinces. In *England* more especially, it is not uncommon to meet with books, in which not only the doctrines of the Gospel, but also the perfections of the Deity, and the solemn obligations of piety and virtue, are impudently called in question, and turned into derision [1]. Such impious productions have cast a deserved reproach on the names and memories of TOLAND, COLLINS, TYNDAL, WOOLSTON [m], MORGAN, CHUBB, MANDEVILLE, and others. And writers of the same class will be soon found in all the countries of *Europe*, particularly in those where the reformation has introduced a spirit of liberty, if mercenary booksellers are

[1] This observation, and the examples by which it is supported in the following sentence, stand in need of some correction. Many books have, indeed, been published in *England* against the divinity, both of the Jewish and Christian dispensation; and it is justly to be lamented, that the inestimable blessing of religious liberty, which the wise and good have improved to the glory of Christianity by setting its doctrines and precepts in a rational light, and bringing them back to their primitive simplicity, has been so far abused, by the pride of some and the ignorance and licentiousness of others, as to excite an opposition to the Christian system, which is both designed and adapted to lead man, through the paths of wisdom and virtue, to happiness and perfection. It is, nevertheless, carefully to be observed, that the most eminent of the English unbelievers were far from renouncing, at least in their writings and profession, the truths of, what they call, natural religion, or denying the unchangeable excellence and obligations of virtue and morality. Dr. MOSHEIM is more especially mistaken, when he places COLLINS, TYNDAL, MORGAN, and CHUBB, in the list of those who called in question the perfections of the Deity and the obligations of virtue; it was sufficient to put MANDEVILLE, WOOLSTON, and TOLAND, in this infamous class.]

[m] In the original we read WOOLASTON, and our author is not the first who has been led, by the similarity of the names, to confound this excellent writer with the infamous and wrong-headed WOOLSTON, at whose name even some of the Deists blush.]

still

still allowed to publish, without distinction or reserve, every wretched production, that is addressed to the passions of men, and designed to obliterate in their minds a sense of religion and virtue. CENT. XVIII.

VI. The sect of *Atheists*, by which, in strictness of speech, those only are to be meant who deny the existence and moral government of an infinitely wise and powerful Being, by whom all things subsist, is reduced to a very small number, and may be considered as almost totally extinct. Any, that yet remain under the influence of this unaccountable delusion, adopt the system of SPINOZA, and suppose the universe to be one vast substance, which excites and produces a great variety of motions all uncontrollably necessary, by a sort of *internal force*, which they carefully avoid defining with perspicuity and precision. Atheists and Deists.

The Deists, under which general denomination those are comprehended who deny the divine origin of the Gospel in particular, and are enemies to all revealed religion in general, form a motley tribe, which, on account of their jarring opinions, may be divided into different classes. The most decent, or, to use a more proper expression, the least extravagant and insipid form of deism, is that, which aims at an association between Christianity and natural religion, and represents the Gospel as no more than a republication of the original law of nature and reason, that was more or less obliterated in the minds of men. This is the hypothesis of TYNDAL, CHUBB, MANDEVILLE, MORGAN, and several others, if we are to give credit to their own declarations, which, indeed, ought not always to be done without caution. This also appears to have been the sentiment of an ingenious writer, whose eloquence has been ill employed in a book, entitled, *Essential Religion distinguished from that which is only Accessory* [n]; for the whole religious system of this author consists in the three following points: That *there is a God*—that *the world is governed by his wise providence*—and that *the soul is immortal*; and he maintains, that it was to establish these three points by his ministry, that JESUS CHRIST came into the world.

VII. The church of Rome has been governed, since the commencement of this century, by CLEMENT XI, INNOCENT XIII, BENEDICT XIII, CLEMENT XII, and BENEDICT XIV, who may be all considered as men of eminent wisdom, virtue, and learning, if we compare them with the pontiffs of the preceding ages. CLEMENT XI, and PROSPER LAMBERTINI who at present fills the papal chair under the title of BENEDICT XIV [o], stand much higher in the list of literary fame, than the other pontiffs now mentioned; and BENEDICT XIII surpassed them all in piety, or at least in its appearance, which in the whole of his conduct was extraordinary and The Romish church—and its pontif.

[(n) The original title of this book (which is supposed to have been written by one MURALT, a Swiss, author of the *Lettres sur les Anglois et sur les François*) is as follows: *Lettres sur la religion essentielle à l'homme, distinguée de ce qui n'en est que l'accessoire*. There have been several excellent refutations of this book published on the continent, among which the *Lettres sur les vrais principes de la religion*, in two volumes, 8^{vo}. composed by the late learned and ingenious Mr. BOUIL-
LER, deserve particular notice.]

[(o) This history was published while BENEDICT XIV was yet alive.]

CENT. XVIII. striking. It was he that conceived the laudable design of reforming many disorders in the church, and restraining the corruption and licentiousness of the clergy; and for this purpose held a council, in the palace of the *Lateran*, in the year 1725, whose acts and decrees have been made public. But the event did not answer his expectations; nor is there any probability, that *BENEDICT XIV.*, who is attempting the execution of the same worthy purpose, though by different means, will meet with better success.

We must not omit observing here, that the modern bishops of *Rome* make but an indifferent figure in *Europe*, and exhibit little more than an empty shadow of the authority of the ancient pontiffs. Their prerogatives are diminished, and their power is restrained within very narrow bounds. The sovereign princes and states of *Europe*, who embrace their communion, no longer tremble at the thunder of the Vatican, but treat their *anathemas* with indifference and contempt. They, indeed, load the *holy father* with pompous titles, and treat him with all the external marks of veneration and respect; yet they have given a mortal blow to his authority by the prudent and artful distinction they make between the court of *Rome* and the Roman pontif. For, under the cover of this distinction, they buffet him with one hand, and stroke him with the other; and, under the most respectful profession of attachment to his person, oppose the measures, and diminish still more, from day to day, the authority of his court. A variety of modern transactions might be alledged in confirmation of this, and more especially the debates that have arisen in this century, between the court of *Rome* and those of *France*, *Naples*, *Sardinia*, and *Portugal*, in all which that ghostly court has been obliged to yield, and to discover its extreme insignificancy and weakness.

All prospect of a reconciliation between the Protestant and Romish communions entirely removed.

VIII. There have been no serious attempts made, in later times, to bring about a reconciliation between the Protestant and Romish churches; for, notwithstanding the pacific projects formed by private persons with a view to this union, it is justly considered as an impracticable scheme. The difficulties that attend its execution were greatly augmented by the famous bull of *CLEMENT XI.*, entitled *Unigenitus*, which deprived the peace-makers of the principal expedient they employed for the accomplishment of this union, by putting it out of their power to soften and mitigate the doctrines of popery, that appeared the most shocking to the friends of the reformation. This expedient had been frequently practised in former times, in order to remove the disgust that the Protestants had conceived against the church of *Rome*; but the bull *Unigenitus* put an end to all these modifications, and, in most of those points that had occasioned our separation from *Rome*, represented the doctrine of that church in the very same shocking light in which they had been viewed by the first reformers. This shews, with the utmost evidence, that all the attempts the Romish doctors have made, from time to time, to give an air of plausibility to their tenets, and render them palatable, were so many snares insidiously laid to draw the Protestants into their communion; that the specious conditions they proposed as the terms of a reconciliation were perfidious stratagems; and that, consequently, there is no

fort

sort of dependence to be made upon the promises and declarations of such a CENT. XVIII. disingenuous set of men.

IX. The intestine discords, tumults, and divisions, that reigned in the Romish church, during the preceding century, were so far from being terminated in this, that new fuel was added to the flame, and the animosities of the contending parties grew more vehement from day to day. These divisions still subsist. The Jesuits are at variance with the Dominicans, and some other religious orders, though these quarrels make little noise, and are carried on with some regard to decency and prudence; the Dominicans are on bad terms with the Franciscans; the controversy concerning the nature, lawfulness, and expediency of the Chinese ceremonies still continues, at least in *Europe*; and, were we to mention all the debates that divide the Romish church, which boasts so much of its unity and infallibility, the enumeration would be endless. The controversy relating to Jansenism, which was one of the principal sources of that division which reigned within the papal jurisdiction, has been carried on, with great spirit and animosity, in *France* and in the *Netherlands*. The Jansenists, or, as they rather chuse to be called, the disciples of AUGUSTIN, are inferior to their adversaries the Jesuits in numbers, power, and influence; but they equal them in resolution, prudence, and learning, and surpass them in sanctity of manners and superstition, by which they excite the respect of the people. When their affairs take an unfavourable turn, and they are oppressed and persecuted by their victorious enemies, they find an azylum in the *Netherlands*. For the greatest part of the Roman-catholics in *Spanish Flanders*, and all the members of that communion that live under the jurisdiction of the United Provinces, embrace the principles and doctrines of JANSENIUS [p]. Those that inhabit the United Provinces have almost renounced their allegiance to the pope, though they profess a warm attachment to the doctrine and communion of the church of *Rome*; nor are either the exhortations or threatenings of the *holy father* sufficient to banish the obstinacy of these wayward children, or to reduce them to a state of subjection and obedience.

Intestine divisions in the Romish church.

X. The cause of the Jansenists acquired a peculiar degree of credit and reputation, both in this and the preceding century, by a French translation of the New Testament, made by the learned and pious PASCHASIUS QUENEL, a priest of the oratory, and accompanied with practical annotations, adapted to excite lively impressions of religion in the minds of men. The quintessence of Jansenism was blended, in an elegant and artful manner, with these Annotations, and was thus presented to the reader under the most

The debates occasioned by Quenel's New Testament.

[(p) This assertion is too general. It is true, that the greatest part of the Roman-catholics in the United Provinces are Jansenists, and that there is no *legal* toleration of the Jesuits in that republic. It is, nevertheless, a known fact, and a fact that cannot be indifferent to those who have the welfare and security of these provinces at heart, that the Jesuits are daily gaining ground among the Dutch papists. They have a flourishing chapel in the city of *Utrecht*, and have places of worship in several other cities and in a great number of villages. It would be worthy of the wisdom of the rulers of the republic to put a stop to this growing evil, and not to suffer in a Protestant country a religious order which has been suppressed in a Popish one, and declared enemies of the state.]

pleasing

CENT. XVIII.

pleasing aspect. The Jesuits were alarmed at the success of QUENEL's book, and particularly at the change it had wrought in many in favour of the theological doctrines of JANSENIUS; and, to remove out of the way an instrument which proved so advantageous to their adversaries, they engaged that weak Prince LEWIS XIV, to solicit the condemnation of this production at the court of *Rome*. CLEMENT XI granted the request of the French monarch, because he considered it as the request of the Jesuits; and, in the year 1713, issued out the famous bull *Unigenitus*, in which QUENEL's New Testament was condemned, and an *hundred and one propositions*, contained in it, pronounced heretical. This bull, which is also known by the name of *The Constitution*, gave a favourable turn to the affairs of the Jesuits; but it was highly detrimental to the interests of the Romish church, as many of the wiser members of that communion candidly acknowledge. For it not only confirmed the Protestants in their separation, by convincing them, that the church of *Rome* was resolved to adhere obstinately to its ancient superstitions and corruptions; but also offended many of the Roman-catholics, who had no particular attachment to the doctrines of JANSENIUS, and were only bent on the pursuit of truth and the advancement of piety. It must also be observed, that the controversy relating to Jansenism was much heated and augmented, instead of being mitigated or suspended, by this despotic and ill-judged edict.

Commutations in
France occasioned
by this bull.

XI. The dissensions and tumults excited in *France* by this edict were violent in the highest degree. A considerable number of bishops, and a large body composed of persons eminently distinguished by their piety and erudition, both among the clergy and laity, appealed from the bull to a general council. It was more particularly opposed by the Cardinal DE NOAILLES, archbishop of *Paris*, who, equally unmoved by the authority of the pontif and by the resentment and indignation of LEWIS XIV, made a noble stand against the despotic proceedings of the court of *Rome*. These defenders of the ancient doctrine and liberties of the Gallican church were persecuted by the popes, the French monarch and the Jesuits, from whom they received an uninterrupted series of injuries and affronts. Nay, their entire ruin was aimed at by these unrelenting adversaries, and was indeed accomplished in part, since some of them were obliged to fly for refuge to their brethren in *Holland*, others forced, by the terrors of penal laws and by various acts of tyranny and violence, to receive the papal edict; while a considerable number, deprived of their places and ruined in their fortunes, looked for subsistence and tranquillity at a greater distance from their native country. The issue of this famous contest was favourable to the bull, which was, at length, rendered valid by the authority of the parliament, and was registered among the laws of the state. This contributed, in some measure, to restore the public tranquillity, but it was far from diminishing the number of those, who complained of the despotism of the pontif; and the kingdom of *France* is still full of *Appellants* [q], who reject the authority

[(q) This was the name that was assumed by those who appealed from the bull and the court of *Rome* to a general council.]

of the *bull*, and only wait for a favourable opportunity of reviving a controversy, which is rather suspended than terminated, and of kindling anew a flame that is covered, without being extinguished.

XII. Amidst the calamities in which the Jansenists have been involved, they have only two methods left of maintaining their cause against their powerful adversaries, and these are their *writings* and their *miracles*. The *former* alone have proved truly useful to them; the *latter* gave them only a transitory reputation, which, being ill-founded, contributed in the issue to sink their credit. The writings in which they have attacked both the Pope and the Jesuits are innumerable; and many of them are composed with such eloquence, spirit, and solidity, that they have produced a remarkable effect. The Jansenists, however, looking upon all human means as insufficient to support their cause, turned their views towards *supernatural* succours, and endeavoured to make it appear that their cause was the peculiar object of the divine protection and approbation. For this purpose they persuaded the multitude, that God had endowed the bones and ashes of certain persons, who had distinguished themselves by their zeal in the cause of JANSENIUS, and had, at the point of death, appealed a second time from the pope to a general council, with the power of healing the most inveterate diseases. The person, whose remains were principally honoured with this marvellous efficacy, was the Abbé PARIS, a man of family, whose natural character was dark and melancholy; his superstition excessive beyond all credibility; and who, by an austere abstinence from bodily nourishment, and the exercise of other inhuman branches of penitential discipline, was the voluntary cause of his own death[r]. To the miracles which were said to be wrought at the tomb of this fanatic, the Jansenists added a great variety of visions and revelations, to which they audaciously attributed a divine origin; for several members of the community, and more especially those who resided at *Paris*, pretended to be filled with the Holy Ghost; and, in consequence of this prerogative, delivered instructions, predictions, and exhortations, which, though frequently extravagant and almost always insipid, yet moved the passions and attracted the admiration of the ignorant multitude. The prudence, however, of the court of *France* put a stop to these fanatical tumults and false miracles; and, in the situation in which things are at present, the Jansenists have nothing left but their genius and their pens to maintain their cause.

The circumstances that contribute to support the cause of Jansenism in France.

XIII. We can say but very little of the Greek and Eastern churches. The profound ignorance in which they live, and the despotic yoke under which they groan, prevent their forming any plans to extend their limits, or making any attempts to change their state. The Russians, as we had formerly occasion to observe, assumed, under the reign of PETER the Great,

The state of the Eastern church.

[(r) The imposture that reigned in these pretended miracles has been detected and exposed by various authors; but by none with more acuteness, perspicuity, and penetration, than by the ingenious Dr. DOUGLASS, in his excellent Treatise on Miracles, entitled, *The Criterion*, which was published by MILLAR, in the year 1754.]

CENT. XVIII. a less savage and barbarous aspect, than they had before that memorable period; and in this century have given some grounds to hope that they may, one day, be reckoned among the civilized nations. There are, nevertheless, immense multitudes of that rugged people, who are still attached to the brutish superstition and discipline of their ancestors; and there are several in whom the barbarous spirit of persecution still so far prevails, that, were it in their power, they would cut off the Protestants and all other sects that differ from them, by fire and sword. This appears evident from a variety of circumstances, and more especially from the book which STEPHEN JAVORSKI has composed against heretics of all denominations.

The Greek Christians are said to be treated at present by their haughty masters with more clemency and indulgence than in former times. The Nestorians and Monophysites in *Asia* and *Africa* persevere in their refusal to enter into the communion of the Romish church, notwithstanding the earnest intreaties and alluring offers, that have been made from time to time by the pope's legates, to conquer their inflexible constancy.—The Roman pontiffs have frequently attempted to renew, by another sacred expedition, their former connexions with the kingdom of *Abyssinia*; but they have not yet been able to find out a method of escaping the vigilance of that court, which still persists in its abhorrence of popery. Nor is it at all probable, that the embassy, which is now preparing at *Rome* for the Abyssinian emperor, will be attended with success.—The Monophysites propagate their doctrine in *Asia* with zeal and assiduity, and have, not long ago, gained over to their communion a part of the Nestorians who inhabit the maritime coasts of *India*.

The external
state of the Lu-
theran church.

XIV. The Lutheran church, which dates its foundation from the year 1517, and the confession of *Augsburg* from the year 1530, celebrated in peace and prosperity the *secular* return of these memorable periods in the years 1717 and 1730. It received, some years ago, a considerable accession to the number of its members by the emigration of that multitude of Protestants which abandoned the territory of *Saltzburg* and the town of *Berch-
tols-gaden*, in order to breathe a free air, and to enjoy unmolested the exercise of their religion. One part of these emigrants settled in *Prussia*, another in *Holland*, and many of them transplanted themselves and their families to *America* and other distant regions. This circumstance contributed greatly to propagate the doctrine and extend the reputation of the Lutheran church, which thus not only obtained a footing in *Asia* and *America*, but also formed several congregations of no small note in these remote parts of the world. The state of Lutheranism at home has not been so prosperous, since we learn both from public transactions and also from the complaints of its professors and patrons, that, in several parts of *Germany*, the Lutheran church has been injuriously oppressed, and unjustly deprived of several of its privileges and advantages, by the votaries of *Rome*.

Its internal state.

XV. It has been scarcely possible to introduce any change into the system of doctrine and discipline that is received in that church, because the ancient confessions and rules that were drawn up to point out the tenets that were

to be believed, and the rites and ceremonies that were to be performed, still remain in their full authority, and are considered as the sacred guardians of the Lutheran faith and worship. The method however of illustrating, enforcing, and defending the doctrines of Christianity, has undergone several changes in the Lutheran church. Towards the commencement of this century, an artless simplicity was generally observed by the ministers of that communion, and all philosophical terms and abstract reasonings were entirely laid aside, as more adapted to obscure than to illustrate the truths of the Gospel. But in process of time a very different way of thinking began to take place; and several learned men entertained a notion, that the doctrines of Christianity could not maintain their ground, if they were not supported by the aids of philosophy, and exhibited and proved in a geometrical order.

The adepts in jurisprudence, who undertook in the last century the revision and correction of the body of ecclesiastical law that is in force among the Lutherans, carried on their undertaking with great assiduity and spirit; and our church government would at this day bear another aspect, if the ruling powers had judged it expedient to listen to their counsels and representations. We see, indeed, in several places, evident proofs, that the directions of these great men, relating to the external form of ecclesiastical government, discipline, and worship, are highly respected; and that their ideas even of the doctrinal part of religion have been more or less adopted by many. Hence, it is not at all surprising, that warm disputes have arisen between them and the rulers of the church, concerning several points. The Lutheran doctors are apprehensive, that, if the sentiments of certain of these reformers took place, religion would become entirely subservient to the purposes of civil policy, and be at length converted into a mere state-machine; and this apprehension is not peculiar to the clergy alone, but is also entertained by some persons of piety and candour, even among the Civilians.

XVI. The liberty of thinking, speaking, and writing, concerning religious matters, which began to prevail in the last century, was, in this, still further confirmed and augmented; and it extended so far to as encourage both infidels and fanatics to pour forth among the multitude, without restraint, all the effusions of their enthusiasm and extravagance. Accordingly we have seen, and still see, numbers of fanatics and innovators start up from time to time, and, under the influence of enthusiasm or of a disordered brain, divulge their crude fancies and dreams among the people, by which they either delude many from the communion of the established church, or at least occasion contests and divisions of the most disagreeable kind. We mentioned formerly several of these disturbers of the tranquillity of the church, to whom we may add here the notorious names of TENNHART, GICHTELIUS, UBERFELD, ROSENBACH, BREDEL, SEIZIUS, ROEMELING, and many others, who either imagined that they were divinely inspired, or from a persuasion of their superior capacity and knowledge set up for reformers of the doctrine and discipline of the church. Many writers

Intestine enemies.

CENT. XVIII. drew their pens against this presumptuous and fanatical tribe; though the greatest part of those who composed it were really below the notice of men of character, and were rather worthy of contempt than of opposition. And, indeed, it was not so much the force of reason and argument, as the experience of their bad success, that convinced these fanatics of their folly, and made them desist from their chimerical projects. Their attempts could not stand the trial of time and common sense; and therefore, after having made a transitory noise, they fell into oblivion. Such is the common and deserved fate of almost all the fanatical ring-leaders of the deluded populace; they start up all of a sudden, and make a figure for a while; but, generally speaking, they ruin their own cause by their imprudence or obstinacy, by their austerity or perverseness, by their licentious conduct or their intestine divisions.

Herrenhutters.
Zinzendorff.

XVII. Many place in this fanatical class the Brethren of *Herrenbut*, who were first formed into a religious community, in the village so named, in *Lusatia*, by the famous Count ZINZENDORFF; and afterwards grew so numerous, that their emigrants were spread abroad in all the countries of *Europe*, reached even as far as the *Indies*, and formed settlements in the remotest quarters of the globe. The Herrenhutters call themselves the descendants of the *Bohemian* and *Moravian Brethren*, who, in the fifteenth century, threw off the despotic yoke of *Rome*, animated by the zealous exhortations and the heroic example of JOHN HUSS. They may however be said, with more propriety, to imitate the example of that famous community, than to descend from those who composed it; for it is well known, that there are very few *Bohemians* and *Moravians* in the fraternity of the *Herrenbutter*s; and it is extremely doubtful, whether even this small number are to be considered as the posterity of the ancient *Bohemian Brethren* that distinguished themselves so early by their zeal for the reformation.

If we are to give credit to the declarations of the *Herrenbutter*s, they agree with the Lutherans in their doctrine and opinions, and only differ from them in their ecclesiastical discipline, and in those religious institutions and rules of life which form the resemblance between the *Bohemian Brethren* and the disciples of ZINZENDORFF. There are, indeed, many who doubt much of the truth of this declaration, and suspect that the society now under consideration, and more especially their rulers and ring-leaders, speak the language of Lutheranism, when they are among the Lutherans, in order to obtain their favour and indulgence; and those who have examined this matter with the most attention represent this fraternity as composed of persons of different religions, as well as of various ranks and orders. Be that as it may, it is at least very difficult to guess the reason, that induces them to live in such an entire state of separation from the Lutheran communion, and to be so ambitiously zealous in augmenting their sect, if the only difference between them and the Lutherans lies in the nature of their discipline, and in certain rites and institutions that do not belong to the essence of religion. For the true and genuine followers of JESUS CHRIST are but little concerned about the outward forms of ecclesiastical government

ment and discipline, knowing that real religion consists in faith and charity, CENT. XVIII. and not in external rites and institutions [s].

XVIII. It was the opinion of many, that the succours of philosophy were absolutely necessary to stem the torrent of superstition and stop its growing progress, and that these alone were adapted to accomplish this desirable purpose. Hence the study of philosophy, which, towards the conclusion of the last century, seemed to decline, was now revived, established upon a more rational footing, and pursued with uncommon assiduity and ardor. The branch of philosophy, which is commonly known under the denomination of *Metaphysics*, was generally preferred, as it leads to the first principles of things; and the improvements made in this important science were very considerable. These improvements were owing chiefly to the genius and penetration of the immortal LEIBNITZ, who cast a new light upon metaphysics, and gave this interesting branch of philosophy a more regular form. This science received a still greater degree of perfection from the philosophical labours of the acute and indefatigable WOLF, who reduced it into a scientific order, and gave its decisions the strength and evidence of a geometrical demonstration. Under this new and respectable form it captivated the attention and esteem of the greatest part of the German philosophers, and of those in general who pursue truth through the paths of strict evidence; and it was applied with great ardour and zeal to illustrate and confirm the great truths both of natural and revealed religion. This application of the *First Philosophy* gave much uneasiness to some pious men, who were extremely solicitous to preserve pure and unmixed the doctrines of Christianity; and it was accordingly opposed by them with great eagerness and obstinacy. Thus the ancient contest between *Philosophy* and *Theology*, *Faith* and *Reason*, was unhappily revived, and has been carried on with much animosity for several years past. For many are of opinion, that this metaphysical philosophy inspires youthful minds with notions that are far from being favourable to the doctrines, and more especially to the positive institutions of religion; that, seconded by the warmth of fancy, at

The state of philosophy among the Lutherans.

[s] It is somewhat surprizing to hear Dr. MOSHEIM speak in such vague and general terms of this sect, without taking the least notice of their pernicious doctrines and their flagitious practices, that do not only disfigure the sacred truths of the Gospel, but also sap all the foundations of morality. To be persuaded of this, the reader, besides the accounts which RIMMUS has given of this enormous sect, will do well to consult a curious *Preface*, prefixed to the French translation of *A Pastoral Letter against Fanaticism*, addressed, by Mr. STINSTRA, an Anabaptist minister in *Friesland*, to his congregation, and published at *Leyden* in the year 1752. It may not be amiss to add here a passage, relating to this odious community, from the bishop of GLOUCESTER's treatise, entitled, *The Doctrine of Grace*. The words of that great and eminent prelate are as follows: "As purity respects practice, the *Moravians* give us little trouble. If we may credit the yet unconfuted relations both in print and in Ms. composed by *their own members*, the participants in their most sacred mysterious rites, their practices in the consummation of marriage are so horribly, so unspeakably flagitious, that this people seems to have no more pretence to be put into the number of Christian sects, than the TURLUPINS of the thirteenth century, a vagabond crew of miscreants, who rambled over *Italy*, *France*, and *Germany*, calling themselves the *Brothers and Sisters of the Free Spirit*, who, in speculation, professed that species of Atheism, called *Pantheism*, and, in practice, pretended to be exempted from all the obligations of morality and religion." See *Doctrine of Grace*, 12^{mo}. vol. ii. p. 153.]

CENT. XVIII. that age of levity and presumption, it engenders an arrogant contempt of divine revelation, and an excessive attachment to human reason, as the only infallible guide of man; and that, instead of throwing new light on the science of theology and giving it an additional air of dignity, it has contributed, on the contrary, to cover it with obscurity and to sink it into oblivion and contempt.

The Wertheim translation of the Bible.

XIX. In order to justify this heavy charge against the metaphysical philosophy, they appeal to the writings of LAURENT SCHMIDT, whom they commonly call the *Wertheim*-interpreter, from the place of his residence. This man, who was by no means destitute of abilities and had acquired a profound knowledge of the philosophy now under consideration, undertook, some years ago, a new German translation of the holy Scriptures, to which he prefixed a new system of theology, drawn up in a geometrical order, that was to serve him as a guide in the exposition of the sacred oracles. This undertaking proved highly detrimental to its author, as it drew upon him from many quarters severe marks of opposition and resentment; for, scarcely had he published the Five Books of MOSES, as a specimen of his method and abilities, when he was not only attacked by several writers, but also brought before the supreme tribunal of the empire, and there accused as an enemy of the Christian religion and a caviller at divine truth. This severe charge was founded upon this circumstance only, that he had boldly departed from the common explication of certain passages in the books of MOSES, which are generally supposed to prefigure the MESSIAH [1]. On this account he was cast into prison, and his errors were looked upon as capitally criminal; but he luckily escaped the vigilance of his keepers, and saved himself by flight.

The controversies called Pietistical, and other religious contests, divide the Lutheran church.

XX. The bare indication of the controversies that have divided the Lutheran church since the commencement of this century would make up a long list. The religious contests that were set on foot by the *Pietists* were carried on in some places with animosity, in others with moderation, according to the characters of the champions, and the temper and spirit of the people. These contests, however, have gradually subsided in process of time, and seem at present to be all reduced to the following question, *Whether a wicked man be capable of acquiring a true and certain knowledge of divine things, or be susceptible of any degree or species of divine illumination?* The controversy, that has been excited by this question, is considered by many as a mere dispute about words; its decision, at least, is rather a matter of curiosity than importance. Many other points, that had been more or less debated in the last century, occasioned keen contests in this, such as the *eternity of hell torments*; the *reign of CHRIST upon earth during a thousand years*; and the *final restoration of all intelligent Beings to order, perfection, and happiness*.

[(1) Dr. MOSHEIM gives here but the half of the accusation brought against SCHMIDT, in the year 1737, when he was charged with attempting to prove, that there was not the smallest trace or vestige of the doctrine of the Trinity, nor any prediction pointing out the MESSIAH, to be found in the Five Books of MOSES. It was by the authority of an imperial edict, addressed by CHARLES VI to the princes of the empire, that SCHMIDT was imprisoned.]

ness. The mild and indulgent sentiments of JOHN FABRICIUS, professor of divinity at *Helmstadt*, concerning the importance of the controversy between the Lutherans and Roman-catholics, excited also a warm debate; for this doctor, together with his disciples, went so far as to maintain, that the difference between the two churches was of so little consequence, that a Lutheran might safely embrace popery. The famous controversies that have been carried on between certain divines and some eminent civilians, concerning the rites and obligations of wedlock, the lawful grounds of divorce, and the nature and guilt of concubinage, are sufficiently known. Other disputes of inferior moment, which have been of a sudden growth and of short duration, we shall pass over in silence, as the knowledge of them is not necessary to our forming an accurate idea of the internal state of the Lutheran church.

XXI. The Reformed church carries still the same external aspect under which it has been already described [u]. For, though there be every where extant certain books, creeds, and confessions, by which the wisdom and vigilance of ancient times thought proper to perpetuate the truths of religion, and to preserve them from the contagion of heresy; yet, in most places no person is obliged to adhere strictly to the doctrines they contain; and those who profess the main and fundamental truths of the Christian religion, and take care to avoid too great an intimacy [w] with the tenets of Socinianism and Popery, are deemed worthy members of the Reformed church [x]. Hence, in our times, this great and extensive community comprehends, in its bosom, Arminians, Calvinists, Supralapsarians, Sublapsarians, and Universalists, who live together in charity and friendship [y].

The state of
the Reformed
church.

[(u) This description the reader will find above, p. 187. see particularly the note [t], p. 188.]

[(w) *Nimiam consuetudinem*. The expression is remarkable and malignant; it would make the ignorant and unwary apt to believe, that the Reformed church allows its members certain approaches towards Popery and Socinianism, provided they do not carry these approaches too far, even to an intimate union with them. This representation of the Reformed church is too glaringly false to proceed from ignorance; and Dr. MOSHEIM's extensive knowledge places him beyond the suspicion of an involuntary mistake in this matter. It is true, this reflexion bears hard upon his candour, and we are extremely sorry, that we cannot, in this place, do justice to the knowledge of that great man, without arraigning his equity.]

[x] Nothing can be more unfair, or at least more inaccurate, than this representation of things. It proceeds from a supposition that is quite chimerical, even that the Reformed churches in *England, Scotland, Holland, Germany, Switzerland, &c.* form one general body, and have, besides their respective and particular systems of government and discipline, some general laws of religious toleration, in consequence of which they admit a variety of sects into their communion. But this general Hierarchy does not exist. The friends of the reformation, whom the multiplied horrors and absurdities of popery obliged to abandon the communion of *Rome*, were formed, in process of time, into distinct ecclesiastical bodies, or national churches, every one of which has its peculiar form of government and discipline. The toleration, that is enjoyed by the various sects and denominations of Christians, arises in part from the clemency of the ruling powers, and from the charity and forbearance, which individuals think themselves bound to exercise, one towards another. See the following note.]

[(y) If the different denominations of Christians, here mentioned, live together in the mutual exercise of charity and benevolence, notwithstanding the diversity of their theological opinions, this circumstance, which Dr. MOSHEIM seems to mention as a reproach, is, on the contrary, a proof, that the true and genuine spirit of the Gospel (which is a spirit of forbearance, meekness, and charity) prevails among the members of the Reformed churches. But it must be carefully ob-

and

CENT. XVIII.

and unite their efforts in healing the breach and diminishing the weight and importance of those controversies that separate them from the communion of the Romish church [z]. This moderation is, indeed, severely censured by many of the Reformed doctors in *Switzerland, Germany*, and more especially in *Holland*, who lament in the most sorrowful strains the decline of the ancient purity and strictness that characterised the doctrine and discipline of the church, and sometimes attack with the strongest marks of indignation and resentment these modern contemners of primitive orthodoxy. But as the moderate party has an evident superiority in point of numbers, power, and influence, these attacks of their adversaries are, generally speaking, treated with the utmost indifference.

Projects of re-union between the Reformed and the Lutherans.

XXII. Whoever therefore considers all these things with due attention will be obliged to acknowledge, that neither the Lutherans nor Arminians have, at this day, any further subject of controversy or debate with the Reformed church, considered in a general point of view, but only with individuals, with private persons that are members of this great community [a].

served, that this charity, though it discover the amiable *bond of peace*, does not, by any means, imply uniformity of sentiment, indifference about truth, or suppose that the Reformed churches have relaxed or departed from their system of doctrine. Indeed, as there is no general Reformed church, so there is no general Reformed Creed or Confession of faith. The established church of *England* has its peculiar system of doctrine and government, which remains still unchanged and in full force; and to which an assent is demanded from all its members, and, in a more especial solemn and express manner, from those who are its ministers. Such is the case with the national Reformed churches in the United Provinces. The dissenters in these countries, who are tolerated by the state, have also their respective bonds of ecclesiastical union; and such of them, particularly in *England* and *Ireland*, as differ from the establishment only in their form of government and worship, and not in matters of doctrine, are treated with indulgence by the more moderate members of the national church, who look upon them as their Brethren.]

[(z) How such a strange and groundless aspersions could escape the pen of our excellent historian is difficult to conceive. The Reformed churches were never at such a distance from the spirit and doctrine of the church of *Rome*, as they are at this day. The improvements in science, that characterise the last and the present age, seem to render a relapse into Romish superstition morally impossible in those who have been once delivered from its baneful influence. If the dawn of science and philosophy, towards the end of the sixteenth and the commencement of the seventeenth century, was so favourable to the cause of the reformation, how must their progress, which has a kind of influence even upon the multitude, confirm us in the principles, that occasioned our separation from the church of *Rome*? Besides; that very spirit of toleration and charity, that our author mentions as the leading principle of, what he calls, the Reformed church, must, in the nature of things, increase the disgust of its members against popery, the essential character of which is a spirit of despotism and persecution, founded upon an extravagant and ridiculous pretension to infallibility.]

[(a) Granting this to be true, with respect to the Arminians, it cannot be affirmed, with equal truth, in regard to the Lutherans, whose doctrine concerning the *Corporal presence of CHRIST in the eucharist, and the communication of the properties of his divine to his human nature*, is rejected by all the Reformed churches, without exception. But it is not universally true, even with respect to the Arminians. For though these latter are particularly favoured by the church of *England*; though Arminianism may be said to have become predominant among the members of that church, or at least to have lent its influence in mitigating some of its articles in the private sentiments of those who subscribe them; yet the Thirty-nine Articles of the church of *England* still maintain their authority; and when we judge of the doctrine and discipline of any church, it is more natural to form this judgment from its *established Creeds and Confession of Faith*, than from the sentiments and principles of particular persons. So that, with the respect to the church of *England*, the direct contrary of what Dr. MOSHEIM asserts is strictly true; for it is rather with that church and its rule

For

For the church, considered in its collective and general character, allows CENT. XVIII. now to all its members the full liberty of entertaining the sentiments they think most reasonable in relation to those points of doctrine that formerly excluded the Lutherans and Arminians from its communion, and looks upon the essence of Christianity and its fundamental truths as in no wise affected by these points, however variously they may be explained by the contending parties. But this moderation, instead of facilitating the execution of the plans, that have been proposed by some, for the re-union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, contribute rather to prevent this re-union, or at least to render it much more difficult. For those among the Lutherans, who are zealous for the maintainance of the truth, complain that the Reformed church has rendered too wide the way of salvation, and opened the arms of fraternal love and communion, not only to us (Lutherans), but also to Christians of all sects and all denominations. Accordingly we find, that when, about twenty years ago, several eminent doctors of our communion, with the learned and celebrated MATTHEW PFAFF at their head, employed their good offices with zeal and sincerity in order to our union with the Reformed church; this pacific project was so warmly opposed by the greatest part of the Lutherans, that it came to nothing in a short time [b].

XXIII. The church of *England*, which is now the chief and leading branch of that great community that goes under the denomination of the Reformed church, continues in the same state, and is governed by the same principles, that it assumed at the revolution under the reign of King WILLIAM III. The established form of church-government is *Episcopacy*, which is embraced by the sovereign, the nobility, and the greatest part of the people. The *Presbyterians*, and the numerous sects of different deno-

The present state
of the church of
England.

of faith, that the Lutherans are at variance, than with private persons, who, prompted by a spirit of Christian moderation, mitigate some of its doctrines, in order charitably to extend the limits of its communion. But, if we turn our view to the Reformed churches in *Holland, Germany*, and a part of *Switzerland*, the mistake of our author will still appear more palpable; for some of these churches consider certain doctrines, both of the Arminians and Lutherans, as a just cause of excluding them from their communion. The question here is not whether this rigour is laudable; it is the matter of fact, that we are examining at present. The church of *England*, indeed, if we consider its present temper and spirit, does not look upon any of the errors of the Lutherans as *fundamental*, and is therefore ready to receive them into its communion; and the same thing may, perhaps, be affirmed of several of the Reformed churches upon the continent. But this is very far from being a proof, that the Lutherans have, at this day (as Dr. MOSHEIM asserts), *no further subject of controversy or debate with these churches*; it only proves, that these churches nourish a spirit of toleration and charity, *worthy of imitation*.]

[(b) The project of the very pious and learned Dr. PFAFF for uniting the Lutheran and Reformed churches, and the reasons on which he justified this project, are worthy of the truly Christian spirit, and do honour to the accurate and sound judgment of that most eminent and excellent divine *. And it is somewhat surprizing, considering the proofs of moderation and judgment that Dr. MOSHEIM has given in other parts of this valuable history, that he neither mentions the project of Dr. PFAFF with applause, nor the stiffness of the Lutherans on this occasion with any mark of disapprobation.]

* See this learned Author's *Collegio Scriptorum Irenicorum ad unionem inter Protestantem facientium*, published in 4^{to} at *Hall* in *Saxony*, in the year 1723.

CENT. XVIII. minations that are comprehended under the general title of *Non-conformists*, enjoy the sweets of religious liberty, under the influence of a *legal* toleration. Those, indeed, who are best acquainted with the present state of the English nation, tell us, that the dissenting interest declines from day to day, and that the cause of *Non-conformity* owes this gradual decay, in a great measure, to the lenity and moderation that are practised by the rules of the established church. The members of this church may be divided into two classes, according to their different ideas of the origin, extent, and dignity of episcopal jurisdiction. For some look upon the government of bishops to be founded on the authority of a divine institution, and are immoderately zealous in extending the power and prerogatives of the church; others, of a more mild and sedate spirit, while they consider the episcopal form of government as far superior to every other system of ecclesiastical polity, and warmly recommend all the precautions that are necessary to its preservation and the independence of the clergy, yet do not carry this attachment to such an excessive degree, as to refuse the name of a *church* to every religious community that is not governed by a bishop, or to defend the prerogatives and pretensions of the episcopal order with an intemperate zeal. These two classes are sometimes involved in warm debates, and oppose each other with no small degree of animosity, of which this present century has exhibited the following remarkable example. Dr. BENJAMIN HOADLEY, afterwards bishop of *Winchester*, a prelate eminently distinguished by the accuracy of his judgment, and the purity of his flowing and manly eloquence, used his utmost endeavours, and not without success, to lower the authority of the church, or at least to reduce the power of its rulers within narrow bounds. On the other hand, the church and its rulers found several able defenders; and, among the rest, Dr. JOHN POTTER, at that time [c] archbishop of *Canterbury*, who maintained the rights and pretensions of the clergy with great eloquence and erudition. As to the spirit of the established church of *England* in relation to those who dissent from its rule of doctrine and government, we see it no where better than in the conduct of Dr. WAKE, archbishop of *Canterbury*, who formed a project of peace and union between the English and Gallican churches, founded upon this condition, that each of the two communities should retain the greatest part of their respective and peculiar doctrines [d].

[(c) Dr. JOHN POTTER was not archbishop of *Canterbury* at that time, nor till many years after the controversy here mentioned was at an end. He was then bishop of *Oxford*, and, in a charge to the clergy of that diocese, he attacked some of Bishop HOADLEY's opinions.]

[(d) Archbishop WAKE certainly corresponded with some learned and moderate *Frenchmen*, on this subject; particularly with DU PIN the ecclesiastical historian: and, no doubt, the archbishop, when he assisted COURAYER, in his *Defence of the validity of the English Ordinations*, by furnishing him with unanswerable proofs drawn from the registers at *Lambeth*, had it in his view to remove certain groundless prejudices, which, while they subsisted amongst Roman-catholics, could not but defeat all projects of peace and union between the English and Gallican churches. The interests of the Protestant religion could not be in safer hands than Archbishop WAKE's. He who had so ably and so successfully defended Protestantism as a controversial writer, could not surely form any project of peace and union with a Roman-catholic church, the terms of which would have reflected on his character as a negociator.]

XXIV. The unbounded liberty, which every individual in *England* enjoys of publishing without restraint his religious opinions, and of worshipping God in the manner he thinks the most conformable to reason and scripture, naturally produces a variety of sects, and gives rise to an uninterrupted succession of controversies about theological matters. It is scarcely possible for any historian, that has not resided for some time in *England*, and examined with attention, upon the spot, the laws, the privileges, the factions, and opinions, of that free and happy people, to give a just and accurate account of these religious sects and controversies. Even the names of the greatest part of these sects have not as yet reached us, and many of those that are come to our knowledge, we know but imperfectly. We are greatly in the dark with respect to the grounds and principles of these controversies, because we are destitute of the sources from whence proper information must be drawn. At present the ministerial labours of GEORGE WHITEFIELD, who has formed a community, which he proposes to render superior in sanctity and perfection to all other Christian churches, make a considerable noise in *England*, and are not altogether destitute of success. If there is any consistency in this man's theological system, and he is not to be looked upon as an enthusiast, who follows no rule but the blind impulse of an irregular fancy, his doctrine seems to amount to these two propositions—
“that true religion consists alone in holy affections and in a certain inward
“feeling, which it is impossible to explain—and that Christians ought not to
“seek truth by the dictates of reason, or by the aids of learning, but by
“laying their minds open to the direction and influence of divine illumi-
“nation.”

Various sects in
England.
Whitefield.

XXV. The Dutch church is still divided by the controversies that arose from the philosophy of DES CARTES and the theology of COCCEIUS; though these controversies be carried on with less bitterness and animosity at present than in former times. It is even to be hoped that these contests will soon be totally extinguished, since it is well known, that the Newtonian philosophy has expelled Cartesianism from almost all the academies and schools of learning in the United Provinces. We have already mentioned the debates that were occasioned by the opinions of ROELL. In the year 1703, FREDERIC VAN LEENHOF was suspected of a propensity towards the system of SPINOZA, and drew upon him a multitude of adversaries, on account of a remarkable book, entitled, *Heaven upon Earth*; in which he maintained literally, that it was the duty of Christians to rejoice always, and to suffer no feelings of affliction and sorrow to interrupt their gaiety. The same accusations were brought against an illiterate man, named WILLIAM DEURHOFF, who, in some treatises composed in the Dutch language, represented the divine nature under the idea of a certain force or energy, that is diffused throughout the whole universe, and acts in every part of the great fabric. The most recent controversies that have made a noise in *Holland* were those that sprung from the opinions of Mr. JAMES SAURIN and Mr. PAUL MATY, on two very different subjects. The former, who was minister of the French church in the *Hague*, and acquired a shining reputation by

The state of the
Dutch church.

CENT. XVIII. his genius and eloquence, fell into an error, which, if it may be called such, was at least an error of a very pardonable kind. For, if we except some inaccurate and unwary expressions, his only deviation from the received opinions consisted in his maintaining, that it was sometimes lawful to swerve from truth, and to deceive men by our speech, in order to the attainment of some great and important good [e]. This sentiment was not relished, as the most considerable part of the Reformed churches adopt the doctrine of AUGUSTIN, "that a lye or a violation of the truth can never be allowable in itself, or advantageous in the issue." The conduct of MATY was much more worthy of condemnation; for, in order to explain the mystery of the Trinity, he invented the following unsatisfactory hypothesis: "That the *Son* and the *Holy Ghost* were two finite Beings, that had been created by God, and at a certain time were united to the divine nature [f]."

The disputes in Switzerland concerning the FORMULA CONSENSUS, OF FORM OF AGREEMENT.

XXVI. The particular confession of faith, that we have already had occasion to mention under the denomination of the *Formulary of agreement or concord*, has, since the commencement of this century, produced warm and vehement contests in *Switzerland*, and more especially in the Canton of *Bern*. In the year 1718, the magistrates of *Bern* published an order, by which all professors and pastors, particularly those of the university and church of *Lausanne*, who were suspected of entertaining any erroneous opinions, were obliged to declare their assent to this *Formulary*, and to adopt it as the rule of their faith. This injunction was so much the more grievous, as no demand of that kind had been made, for some time before this period; and the custom of requiring subscription to this famous confession had been suspended in the case of several, who were promoted in the academy or had entered into the church. Accordingly many pastors and candidates for holy orders refused the assent that was demanded by the magistrates; and some

[(e) See SAURIN's *Discours Historiques Theologiques, Critiques, et Moraux, sur les evenemens les plus memorables du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament*, tom. i. of the folio edition.]

[(f) Dr. MOSHEIM, in another of his learned productions, has explained in a more exact and circumstantial manner the hypothesis of MATY, which amounts to the following propositions: "That the Father is the pure Deity; and that the Son and the Holy Ghost are two other persons, in each of whom there are two natures; one divine, which is the same in all the three persons, and with respect to which they are one and the same God, having the same numerical divine essence; and the other, a finite and dependent nature, which is united to the divine nature in the same manner, in which the orthodox say, that JESUS CHRIST is God and Man." See MOSHEIM *Dissertationes ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam pertinentes* (published at Altona in the year 1743) vol. ii. p. 498.—But principally the original work of Mr. MATY, which was published (at the Hague) in the year 1729, under the following title: *Lettre d'un Theologien à un autre Theologien sur le Mystere de la Trinite*.—The publication of this hypothesis was so much the more unnecessary, as that it was really destitute even of the merit of novelty, being very little more than a repetition of what Dr. THOMAS BURNET, prebendary of *Sarum*, and rector of *West-kington* in *Wiltshire*, had said, about ten years before, upon this mysterious subject, which nothing but presumption can make any man attempt to render intelligible. See a treatise published, without his name, by Dr. BURNET, in the year 1720, under the following title: *The Scripture-Trinity intelligibly explained: Or, An Essay towards the Demonstration of a Trinity in Unity from Reason and Scripture. In a Chain of Consequences from certain Principles, &c.* by a divine of the church of *England*. See also the same Author's *Scripture-Doctrine of the Redemption of the World by Christ, intelligibly explained, &c.*]

of them were punished for this refusal. Hence arose warm contests and heavy complaints, which engaged the king of *Great-Britain* and the States general of the United Provinces to offer their intercession in order to terminate these unhappy divisions; and hence the *Formulary* under consideration lost much of its credit and authority.—Nothing memorable happened during this period in the German churches. The Reformed church that was established in the *Palatinate*, and had formerly been in such a flourishing state, suffered greatly from the persecuting spirit and the malignant counsels of the votaries of *Rome*.

XXVII. The Socinians, who are dispersed through the different countries of *Europe*, have never hitherto been able to form a separate congregation, or to celebrate publicly divine worship, in a manner conformable to the institutions of their sect; though it is well known, that, in several places, they hold clandestine meetings of a religious kind. The person, that made the principal figure among them, in this century, was the learned SAMUEL CRELLIUS, who died, in an advanced age, at *Amsterdam*; he, indeed, preferred the denomination of *Artemonite* before that of Socinian, and really departed, in many points, from the received doctrines of that sect.

Socinians.
Arians.

The Arians found a learned and resolute patron in WILLIAM WHISTON, professor of mathematics in the university of *Cambridge*, who defended their doctrine in various productions, and chose rather to resign his chair than to renounce his opinions. He was followed in these opinions, as is commonly supposed, by Dr. SAMUEL CLARK, a man of great abilities, judgment, and learning, who, in the year 1724, was charged with altering and modifying the ancient and orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. But it must argue a great want of equity and candor to rank this eminent man in the class of Arians, taking that term in its proper and natural signification; for he only maintained, what is commonly called the *Arminian Subordination*, which has been, and is still, adopted by some of the greatest men in *England*, and even by some of the most learned bishops of that nation. This doctrine he illustrated with greater care and perspicuity, than any before him had done, and taught that the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, are equal in nature, but different in rank, authority, and subordination. A great number of English writers have endeavoured, in a variety of ways, to invalidate and undermine the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; and it was this consideration that engaged a lady [g], eminently distinguished by her orthodoxy and opulence, to leave by her testament, a rich legacy, as a foundation for a lecture, in which eight sermons are preached annually by a learned divine, who is nominated to that office by the trustees. This foundation has subsisted since the year 1720, and promises to posterity an ample collection of learned productions in defence of this branch of the Christian faith.

[g] Lady MOYER.

Advertisement.

THE following Tables have been compiled with much attention and pains from the best authors; and it is therefore hoped, that they will be considered as a useful addition to Dr. MOSHEIM's Work; and the more so, as they are not confined to the *persons* and *things* contained in it.

The dates, that are placed in the columns which contain the SOVEREIGN PRINCES and POPES, are designed to mark the year of their decease.

As several of the *Ecclesiastical* and *Theological Writers*, mentioned in these Tables, deserve a place also among *Profane Authors*, on account of their Philosophical, Literary, or Historical Productions; so their names will be repeated in the two distinct columns that contain the learned men of each century.

It is further to be observed, that the Romish Church, even long before the time of the Reformation, looked upon many persons as *Heretics*, whom we, on our principles, cannot consider in the same light, and whose doctrines really tended to promote that Reformation in which we glory. I have therefore, in many places, added the words *real* or *reputed* after *Heretics*, rather than seem to submit to the decisions of a superstitious Church in this matter.

CHRONO-

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES.

CENTURY I.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.	Heretics.	Remarkable Events.	Profane Authors.
<i>Roman Emperors.</i>	<i>The succession of the first Bishops of Rome is a matter full of intricacy and obscurity. — We shall herein follow the learned Bp. Pearson.</i>	<i>The Evangelists and Apostles</i>	Dositheus	The Tax of Augustus Cæsar.	Titus Livius
Augustus 14		The three Apostolic Fathers	Simon Magus	The Birth of Christ.	Germanicus
Tiberius 37		Clement	The Gnostics	The Offerings, presented to Jesus Christ, by the Wise Men from the East.	Gratius
Caligula 41		Barnabas	Cerinthus	The Four Passovers celebrated by Christ.	Ovid
Claudius 54		Hermas	Hymenæus	John the Baptist beheaded.	Julius Hyginus
Nero 68		Philo, the Jew	Philetus, who together with Demas and Diotrophes are rather to be considered as Apostates, than as Heretics.	Christ's miracles, sufferings, death, resurrection and ascension.	Labeo
Galba 69		Flavius Josephus	The Nicolaitans	The Descent of the Holy Ghost.	Valerius Maximus
Otho 69		<i>These are almost all the genuine Ecclesiastical Writers of the First Century, that are now extant.</i>	Ebion	St. Stephen, the first Martyr.	Phædrus
Vitellius 70	Linus	For the Letter of Jesus Christ to Abgarus king of Edessa — the Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Liturgies, that have (besides those which we esteem Canonical) been attributed to the Apostles — as also the Epistles of Mary to Ignatius and others — the Acts of Pilate — the Epistles of Seneca to St. Paul — &c. must be considered as apocryphal and spurious.	The Nazarenes	The Conversion of St. Paul.	Verrius Flaccus
Vespasian 79	Anacletus		N. B. The Ebionites and Nazarenes, tho' generally placed by the learned in the First Century, yet belong more properly to the Second.	Institution of Agape, or Feasts of Charity.	Strabo
Titus 81	Clement			Baptism is administered by Immersion.	Dionysius of Alexand.
Domitian 96	Evaristus			Several Christian churches founded.	Seneca, the Rhetor.
Nerva 98	Alexander			The First Persecution under Nero.	Seneca, the Philosopher and Poet
	<i>The dates of the deaths of the Roman Pontiffs are not the same in the accounts of Chronologers. Petau, Fleury, Pearson, Marcel. Pfaff, Bower, Lenglet, and others, differ frequently in this respect; and their differences sometimes are considerable.</i>			The Oracles reduced to silence, a dubious, or rather a fabulous, story.	Velleius Paterculus
	<i>For example — The death of Pope Anicetus is placed by Petau and</i>	<i>The Works, that bear the name of</i>		The destruction of Jerusalem.	Cremutius

Sovereign Princes.	Bishops of Rome.	Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.	Heretics.	Remarkable Events.	Profane Authors.
	Lenglet, in the year 161, by Pearson and Pfaff in 162, by Fleury, Walch, and Bower, in 168. <i>As it is impossible to reconcile these historians, and difficult often to decide which calculates best, we shall follow Pearson and Pfaff as the surest guides.</i>	Dionysius the Areopagite, were forged in the Fifth Century.		The accounts of a dispute between St Peter and Simon the Magician at Rome, and of a Statue's having been erected to the latter in that city, seem idle fictions. The Second Persecution of the Christians under Domitian. St. John thrown into a Cauldron of boiling oil; a dubious story. The adventures of Apollonius Tyaneus.	Silius Italicus Valerius Flaccus Pliny, the Elder Pliny, the Younger Asconius Pedianus Plinius Valerianus Juvenal Martial Statius Sext. Jul. Frontinus Quintilian Dion Chrysostome Tacitus Phlegon Appion Trogus Pompeius Athenodorus

CENTURY II.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.	Heretics.	Remarkable Events and Religious Rites and Institutions.	Profane Authors.
<i>Roman Emperors.</i> A. D. Trajan 117 Adrian 138 Antonin. Pius 161 M. Antoninus } Lucius Verus } 180 Commodus 192 Pertinax } 193 Did. Julianus } Niger } 193 Albinus } 194 Severus } 198	Xystus or Sixtus 127 Telephorus 138 Hyginus 150 Pius I 153 Anicetus 162 Soter 172 Eleutherius 185 Victor 196	Ignatius of Antioch Polycarp Justin Martyr Hegesippus Theophilus of Antioch, the first who made use of the word Trinity to express the distinction of what divines call, persons in the Godhead. The Christian church is very little obliged to him for his invention. The use of this and other unscriptural terms, to which men attach either no ideas or false ones, has wounded charity and peace, without promoting truth and knowledge. It has produced heresies of the very worst kind. Melito Tartian * Papias Apollinaris Hermias	Nazarens Gnostics Cainites Elxai Saturninus Millenarians Basilides Isidore, the Son of Carpocrates and his followers. Marcellina and Epiphanes. Prodicus, the chief of the Adamites. Valentine and his followers. * Tatian, supposed to be the chief of the Encratites, Hydrophastates, and Apocastites. Ptolomæus Secundus Cerdo Marcion, Florinus, Docetæ, or Phantasiasts. The Melitonians,	Third Persecution under Trajan, mitigated by the intercession of Pliny, the Younger. Fourth Persecution under Adrian. Fifth Persecution under Antoninus Pius, continued under Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. Conversion of the Germans and Gauls, and (if we may give credit to Bede) of the Britons. The thundering Legion — a dubious event. Insurrections of the Jews against the Romans. Sedition and slaughter of that people under the standards of Barcocheba, the false Messiah. The Jews are driven from Jerusalem. Horrible calumnies	Arrian Aulus Gellius Plutarch Florus Celsus, the Lawyer Cenomaus Philo of Phœnicia Ptolomy, the Astronomer and Geographer Salvius Julianus Suetonius Apollonius, the Philosopher Appian Fronto Maximus Tyrius Taurus Calvinius Apuleius Artemidorus Lucian Numenes Pausanias Polizæus Sextus Empiricus Athenæus Julius Pollux Diogenes Laertius Galienus Ammonius Saccas Priscus Cephalion

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.	Heretics.	Remarkable Events and Religious Rites and Institutions.	Profane Authors.
		Athenagoras Clemens Alexandrinus Tertullian Aquila Theodotion Symmachus Hermes <i>The unknown Author of the Sibylline Oracles.</i> Irenæus Polycrates Dionysius of Corinth Pantenus Quadratus <i>Add to these several Fragments of the writings of some of the principal Heretics mentioned in the following column. These fragments are collected by Cotelerius, Grabe, &c.</i>	The Saccophori, Severians, Ophites, Artotyrites. Theodotus, the Tanner, the chief of the Alogi. Montanus Tertullian Priscilla and Maximilla, who were called Montanists, Cataphryges, and Pepuzians. The Sethites The Abelites Heracleon Bassus Colarbasus Blastus Mark Valentinians Bardefanes Hermogenes Apelles Praxeas, the chief of the Patropassians, Seleucas, and Hermias Artemon	thrown out against the Christians by Lucian, Crescens, Celsus, and the Pagans in general. The perusal of the Sibylline Oracles prohibited by an imperial edict. Christian assemblies are held on Sundays, and other stated days, in private houses, and in the burying-places of Martyrs. Infant Baptism and Sponsors used in this century. Various Festivals and Fasts established. A distinction formed between Bishops and Presbyters, who, with the Deacons and Readers, are the only Orders of Ecclesiastics known in this century. The Sign of the Cross and anointing used. The custom of praying towards the East introduced.	Aristides Hermogenes, who, at the age of 17, published his Rhetoric; at 20, his Book on Ideas; and at 25, is said to have forgot all that he had learned. Justin, Martyr Theophilus of Antioch Chrysolus Marcus Antoninus Harpocration Polyænus Athenagoras Celsus, the Philosopher Julius Solinus Plotinus Papiusian.

CENTURY III.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.	Heretics.	Remarkable Events and Religious Rites and Institutions.	Profane Authors.
Roman Emperors. A. D. Severus 211 Caracalla } 217 Geta } 212 Macrinus 218 Heliogabalus 222 Severus Alexander 235 Maximin 237 Gordian I, II 237	Zephyrinus 219 Callistus 224 Urban 231 Pontianus 235 Anterus 236 Fabianus 251 Cornelius 254 <i>A contest between him and Novatian</i> Lucius 256	The Author of the Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas Minutius Felix Hippolytus Ammonius Julius Africanus Origen Cyprian Novatian Gregory Thaum.	Adelphius Aquilinus Manes, the chief of the Manicheans. Hierax Noetus Sabellius Beryllus Paul of Samosat. Novatians	Sixth Persecution under Severus, in which Leonidas, Irenæus, Victor, bishop of Rome, Perpetua, Felicitas, and others, suffer martyrdom. Seventh Persecution under Maximin VIII, under Decius, in which Fabianus, the Roman	Ælius Maurus Oppian, the Poet Quintus Seren. Samonicus Julius Africanus Acclus Dion Cassius Ulpian Ephorus Censorinus C. Curius Fortunatus

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.	Heretics.	Remarkable Events and Religious Rites and Institutions.	Profane Authors.
<i>Roman Emperors.</i>	Stephen 258	Dionysius of Alexandria	Patropassians	pontit, Babylas, Alexander, and others, suffer martyrdom.	Herodian
A. D.	Sixtus II 259	Pamphilus	Arabians	Eighth Persecution under Valerian, in which those more illustrious Martyrs, Cyprian, Lucius, Stephen I, Sixtus I, and Laurentius, suffer for the faith.	Nicagoras
Pupienus } 238	Dionysius 270	Anatolius	Cathari	Ninth Persecution under Dioclesian, Maximian, Galerius, and Maximin, much more cruel than the preceding, and famous for the martyrdom of the Theban Legion, which however is a very dubious story.	Quadratus
Balbin } 238	Felix 275	Arnobius, African	Valesians	The Jewish Talmud and Targum composed in this century.	Amelius Gentilianus
Gordian III 244	Eutychianus 283	Commodianus	Privatus	The Jews are allowed to return into Palestine.	Erennius Dixippus
Philip the Arabian, supposed to have been the first Christian Emperor 250	Caius 296	Archelaus	A schism between Stephen and Cyprian concerning the rebaptizing of Heretics.	Jewish schools erected at Babylon, Sora, and other places.	Cassius Longinus
Decius 252	Marcellinus	Lucianus		Remarkable deaths of those that persecuted the Christians, related by Tertullian, Eusebius, and Lucius Cæcilius.	Julius Capitolinus
Gallus } 253		Hesychius		Many illustrious men and Roman senators converted to Christianity.	Ælius Lampridius
Volusianus } 253		Methodius		The origin of the Monastic life derived from the austere manners of Paul the Theban, the first Hermit.	Trebellius Pollio
Æmilianus 253		Theognostus		Dioclesian assumes the name and honours due to Jupiter, and orders the people to worship him.	Porphry
Valerian 259		Malchion		Religious rites greatly multiplied in this century; altars used; wax tapers employed.	Ælius Spartianus
Gallienus 268		Paul of Samosata		Public Churches, called in Greek Κυριακὰ, built for the celebration of Divine worship.	Flavius Vopiscus
Claudius II 270		Stephen, R. Pont.		The Pagan mysteries injudiciously imi-	M. Aurel. Olymp.
Quintillus 270		Eusebius, a Deacon of Alexandria			Nemesianus
Aurelian 275		Dionysius, R. Pont.			Alexander, a Greek Philosopher
Tacitus 275		Basilides, Bishop of Pentapolis			Philostratus
Florianus 276		Victorinus			Julius Paulus
Probus 282		Prudentius			Sextus Pomponius
Carus } 283					Herennius Modestinus
Carinus } 284					Hermogenianus
Numerianus } 284					Palladius Rutilius
Diocletian					Taurus Æmilianus
Maximian					Justin
					Julius Calpurnius
					Arnobius, the African

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.	Heretics.	Remarkable Events and Religious Rites and Institutions.	Profane Authors.
				tated in many respects by Christians. The tasting of milk and honey previous to Baptism, and the person anointed before and after that holy Rite — receives a crown and goes arrayed in white for some time after. The story of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus, and the martyrdom of Ursula, and the 11000 British Virgins, the principal fables invented in this century.	

CENTURY IV.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events and Religious Rites and Institutions.	Profane Authors.
<i>Roman Emperors.</i> A. D. Dioclesian and Maximian abdicate the Empire in the year 305 Galerius 311 Constantinus 306 Constantine the Great 337 His adversaries, Maximin 313 Maxentius 312 Licinius 325 Constantine II 338 Constantinus 361 Constantinus 350 Julian, the Apostate 363 Jovian 364 Valentinian 375 Valens 378 Gratian 383 Valentinian II 392 VOL. II.	Marcellinus 304 Marcellus 309 Eusebius 311 Melchisedech 313 Sylvester 335 Mark 336 Julius 352 Liberius 367 A schism between Liberius and Felix. Damasus 384 A new schism between this Pontif and Ursinus. Syriscus 398	Lactantius Firm. Lucius Cæcilius Dorotheus, Bishop of Tyre Eusebius, Bishop of Casarea Constantine the Great Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch Commodianus Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria Juvenius Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria Antonius, who with Paul the Hermit, was the first Instructor of the Monastic life Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra Theodore, Bishop of Heraclea Julius, Bishop of Rome Jul. Firm. Maternus Pachomius Eusebius, Bishop of Emessa	The Manicheans disguised under the denominations of Encratites, Apotactics, Saccophori, Hydroparastates, and Solitaries. Arius and his followers, who were divided into Eunomians, Semi-arians, Eusebians, Homoioussians or Aacacians, and Psathynians Photinus, Apollinarius Father and Son. Macedonius, Anthropomorphites, Priscillian, Andæus, Messalians, or Euchites.	The Tenth Persecution continued. The Athanasians or Orthodox persecuted by Constantius, who was an Arian, and by Valens, who ordered 80 of their deputies, all Ecclesiastics, to be put on board a ship, to which fire was set as soon as it was got clear of the coast. The Christians persecuted by Sapor. The supposed Conversion of Constantine the Great, by a Vision representing a fiery cross in the air. First General Council. It was held at Nice in 325. In it the opinions of Arius were condemned, and the Popes declared equal in dignity with other Christian Bishops. A Second General Council is held in the year 381, at Constanti-	Ælius Donatus Servius Helladius Andronicus Nonius Marcellus Sext. Aurelius Victor Maximus of Smyrna, who is supposed to have taught the Emp. Julian Magic. Oribasius Eutropius Libanius Ausonius Pappus, the famous Mathematician Prudentius Rufus, Festus Avienus Themistius Flavius Vegetius Hierocles Julian Ammianus Marcellinus Symmachus Lactantius Jamblichus Ælius Lampridius Eusebius of Casarea Jul. Firmicus Maternus

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events and Religious Rites and Institutions.	Profane Authors.
Theodosius the Great 395 The division of the Roman Empire into the Eastern and Western Empires. The Visigoths settle in Gaul and Spain about the latter end of this century. Athanasius 382 Alaric		Serapion Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem Hilarius, Bishop of Poitiers Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari Phœbadius, Bishop of Agen Eunomius Zeno, Bishop of Verona Titus, Bishop of Bostra Damasus, Bishop of Rome Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis Optatus, Bishop of Milevi Pacianus Marius Victorinus Liberius, Bishop of Rome Ephrem the Syrian Didymus of Alex. Basil, Bishop of Caesarea Gregory, Bishop of Nazianzum Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa Amphilochius, Bp. of Iconium Hegeippus Apollinarius, Father and Son Eusebius, Bishop of Vercell Diodore, Bishop of Tarsus Proba Falconia The three Macarii, Ambrose Jerom Ruffinus Philastrius Paulinus, Bishop of Nola Augustin John Chrysostom	Collyridians Eustathians Colluthus Helvidius Bonofus Vigilantius Three schisms of the Meletians Luciferians and Donatists	nople, in which the errors of Macedonius are condemned. Remarkable progress of the Christian religion among the Indians, Goths, Marcomanni, and Iberians. The famous Donation of Constantine in favour of the Roman See — A mere fable. The miraculous defeat of Eugenius by Theodosius. Julian's attempt to invalidate the predictions of the Prophets, by encouraging the Jews to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem, defeated by an earthquake and fiery eruption. See the learned Bishop of Gloucester's interesting and ingenious work, entitled, <i>Julian; or, A Discourse &c.</i> Theodosius the Great, is obliged by Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, to do public penance for the slaughter of the Thesalonicians. The Eucharist was, during this century, administered in some places to infants and persons deceased. Something like the doctrine of Transubstantiation is held, and the ceremony of the Elevation used in the celebration of the Eucharist. The council of Elvira in Spain, held in the year 305, not only solemnly forbids the adoration of pictures or images, but even prohibits the use of them. The use of incense and of the censer, with several other superstitious rites introduced — The churches are con-	Chalcidius Pomponius Festus Quintus Curtius Macrobius

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events and Religious Rites and Institutions.	Profane Authors.
				sidered as externally holy, the saints are invoked, images used, and the Cross worshipped. The Clerical Order augmented by new ranks of Ecclesiastics, such as <i>Archdeacons</i>, <i>Country-Bishops</i>, <i>Archbishops</i>, <i>Metropolitans</i>, <i>Exarchs</i>, &c.	

CENTURY V.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events.	Profane Authors.
<i>Emperors of the West.</i> A. D. Honorius 423 Valentinian 455 Maximus 455 Avitus 456 Majoranus 461 Severus 465 Anthemius 472 Olybrius 472 Glycerius deposed in 474 Julius Nepos deposed in 475 Romulus Augustulus, who reigned till the 23d of August, when Odoacer took the title of King of Italy, and put an end to the Western Empire. <i>Kings of Italy.</i> Odoacer 493 Theodoric <i>Emperors of the East.</i> Arcadius 408 Theodosius II 450 Marcianus 457 Leo I 474 Leo II 474	Anastasius 402 Innocent 417 Zosimus 418 Boniface I 423 <i>A schism between this Pope and Eulalius.</i> Celestine I 432 Sixtus III 440 Leo the Great 461 Hilarius 467 Simplicius 483 Felix III 492 Gelasius 496 Anastasius II 498 Symmachus I <i>A schism between him and Laurentius.</i>	Gaudentius, Bishop of Bresse Sulpicius Severus Palladius Heraclides Innocentius Polybius Pelagius Cœlestius Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia Polychronius Nonnus Synesius Isidore of Pelusium Cyril of Alexandria Orosius Marius Mercator Maximus, Bishop of Turin Theodoret Cassian Peter Chrysologus Hilarius Philostorgius Vincent of Lerins Socrates Sozomenes Leo the Great Prosper Idacius Basil Seleucus Arnobius the Younger Claudian Mamertus	Vigilantius Pelagius, Celestius, Julian, Authors of what is called the Pelagian Heresy. John Cassian, Faustus, Gennadius, Vincent of Lirins, Semi-Pelagians. Nestorius, Theodoret, Theodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsus Nestorians. Eutyches Dioscorus The Acephali — Monophysites — Jacobites — Armenians — Theopaschites — Predestinarians — Coelicolæ	Foundation of the French monarchy by Pharamond, or rather by Clovis. An earthquake which swallows up several cities in Palestine. A Third General Council held at Ephesus, at which Nestorius was deposed, in the year 431. A Fourth General Council held at Chalcedon against Eutyches, in the year 451. Progress of Christianity among the Franks and Germans. The conversion of the Irish to the Christian faith attempted in vain by Palladius, but effected by St. Patrick, whose original name was Succathus, and arrived in Ireland in the year 432. Terrible Persecutions carried on against the Christians, in Britain, by the Picts, Scots, and Anglo-Saxons — in Spain, Gaul, and Africa, by the Vandals — in Italy	Anienus Martianus Capella Claudian Eunapius Macrobius Olympiodorus Orosius Peutingier Rutilius Claudius Numantianus Servius Honoratus Sidonius Apollinaris Candidus, the Isaurian Zozimus, the Historian Idacius Quintus or Cointus Priscus Musæus Proclus Simplicius

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.	Heretic real or reputed.	Remarkable Events.	Profane Authors.
Zeno Isaur. 491 Anastasius		Faustus Felix, the Roman Pontif	Peter, the Ful- ler Xenaias	and Pannonia, by the Visigoths—in Africa, by the Donatists and Circumcellions—in Persia, by Isdegerdes— Besides the particular persecutions carried on alternately against the Arians and Athanasians.	
Gotbic Kings of Spain.		Vigilius Tapsensis, supposed by some learned men to have been the author of what is commonly called The Athanasian Creed.		The extinction of the Western Empire.	
Alaric 411		Victor, the African		The Theodosian Code drawn up.	
Ataulphus 415		Gennadius		The city of Venice founded by the inhabitants of the adjacent coast, who fled from the incursion of the Barbarians.	
Sigeric 415		Zosimus		Felix III, bishop of Rome (whom Bower and others look upon as the second pope of that name) is excommunicated, and his name struck out of the Diptychs, or sacred registers by Acacius, bishop of Constantinople.	
Vallia 420		Prosper		Many ridiculous fables invented, during this century; such as the story of the Phial of Oil, brought from heaven by a pigeon at the baptism of Clovis—the Vision of Attala, &c.	
Theodoric 451		Sidonius Apollinar.			
Thorismond 452		Aeneas Gaza			
Theodoric II 466					
Euric 484					
Alaric II					
Kings of France.					
Paramond, first King 420					
Clodion 451					
Meroveus 456					
Childeric 481					
Clovis I					
The Kings of the Vandals in Africa, where they settled in the year 429.					
Genferic 466					
Huneric 484					
Gontamond 496					
Trafamond					
Kings of England.					
Vortigern					
Kingdom of Kent founded by Hengist the Saxon, in 457					
That of Suffex by Aella, in 491					

CENTURY VI.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events.	Learned Men, Historians, Philosophers, and Poets.
Kings of Italy.	Symmachus 514	Cæsarius, Bishop of Arles	Deuterius	Several nations converted to Christianity.	Justinian
A. D.	Hermisdas 523	Fulgentius, Bishop of Ruspa	Severus, leader of the Acephali.	The Canon of the Mass established by Gregory the Great.	Boëthius
Theodoric 526	John I 526	Boëthius	Themistius, chief of the Agnoites, who maintained that Christ was ig-	The Benedictine Order founded.	Procopius
Athalaric 534	Felix IV 529	Timothy of Constantinople		Forty Benedictine	Trebenian
Amalasuntha 534	Boniface II 531	Ennodius			Agathias, who continued the History composed by Procopius.
Theodatus 536	A schism between Boniface and Dioscorus.				Jornandes
Vitiges 540					
Ildebald 541					

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events.	Learned Men, Historians, Philosophers, and Poets.
Totila 553	John II 535	Severus	ignorant of the	Monks, with Augustin	Gregory of Tours
Tejas 554	Agapetus I 536	Cassiodorus	day of judgment.	at their head, are sent	Marius, Bishop of A-
	Silverius 540	Procopius	Barbarians or	into Britain by Gre-	branches, an eminent
Emperors of the East.	<i>A schism between Silverius and Vigilius.</i>	Peter, the Deacon	Semi-dulites, who maintained that Christ had suffered only in appearance.	gory the Great, in the year 596, who convert Ethelbert king of Kent to the Christian faith.	Historian
Anastasius 518	Vigilius 555	Maxentius, a Scythian Monk	Jacob Zanzale, the chief of the Jacobites, or Monophysites.	The kingdom of the Ostrogoths is destroyed by Justinian, who becomes master of Italy.	Menander, the Historian
Justin I 527	Pelagius I 558	Dionysius, the Little	John Philoponus, the chief of the Tritheites.	The Lombards invade Italy in the year 568, and erect a new kingdom at Ticinum.	Stephen of Byzantium
Justinian 565	John III 572	Fulgentius Ferrandus	Damianists	The Christians are persecuted in several places.	Magn. Aurelius Cassiodorus
Justin II 578	Benedict I 577	Marcellinus	Origenists	The orthodox are oppressed by the Emperor Anastasius, Thrasemond king of the Vandals, Theodoric king of the Ostrogoths, &c.	Dionysius the Little
Tiberius II 586	Pelagius II 590	Zachary, the Schoolman	Corrupticolæ		
Mauritius	Gregory I	Hefychius	Accemetæ.		
		Facundus Hermian.	The Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, and Pelagians, continued to raise troubles in the church.		
Gothic Kings of Spain.		Pope Vigilius			
Alaric 507		Rusticus, a Roman Deacon			
Gefalric 512		Junilius			
Amalaric 531		Victor of Capua			
Theuda 548		Primasius			
Theudifilla 548		Jornandes			
Agila 552		Liberatus			
Athanagilda 567		Victor, the African			
Linva 568		Venantius Fortunatus			
Leunigild 585		Anastasius of Mount Sinai, afterwards Bishop of Antioch			
Richared		John, the Schoolman			
These Princes were masters also of Narbonne and Aquitaine.		Cosmas			
		Gildas			
Kings of England.		Leander			
The Third Saxon kingdom is founded in England by Cerdic, in 514, and is called the Kingdom of the West-Saxons.		John of Constantino-ple			
The Fourth, even that of the East-Saxons by Erchenwen, in 527		Columbanus			
The Fifth, that of Northumberland by Ida, in 547		Leontius Byzant.			
The Sixth, that of the East-Angles by Uffa, in 575		Leontius of Cyprus			
The Seventh, that of Mercia by Crida, in 582		Gregory the Great			
Thus was successively formed the SAXON HEPTARCHY.		Ifodorus of Seville			
		Lucius Carinus			
		Proclus Diadochus			

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events.	Learned Men, Historians, Philosophers, and Poets.
Kings of France.				The Justinian Code, Pandect, Institutions, and Novellæ, collected and formed into a body.	
Clovis I 511 <i>The kingdom is divided between his four sons, viz.</i>				<i>Antioch, that was destroyed by an earthquake, is rebuilt by Justinian.</i>	
Thierry, Metz 534				The Fifth General Council assembled at Constantinople in the year 553, under Justinian I, in which the Origenists and the Three Chapters were condemned.	
Clodomire, Orleans 524					
Childebert, Paris 558					
Clotaire, Soissons 562					
<i>A second division of the kingdom between the four sons of Clotaire I, viz.</i>					
Cherebert, Paris 566					
Gontran, Orleans 593					
Chilperic, Soissons 584					
Sigibert, Metz 575					
Kings of the Vandals in Africa.					
Thrasamond 523					
Hilderic 530					
Gilimec, defeated and taken prisoner by Belisarius, in the year 534					
<i>By this event Africa became again subject to the Emperors of the East.</i>					
Kings of the Lombards, who entered into Italy in the year 568.					
Alboinus 571					
Clephis 573					
Antharis 590					
Agilulf					
Exarchs of Ravenna.					
Longinus 583					
Smaragdus 588					
Romanus 598					
Callinicus					

CENTURY VII.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theological Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events.	Profane Authors.
<i>Emperors of the East.</i>	Sabinianus 605 Boniface III 606 — IV 614	Augustine, first archbishop of Canterbury, was nominated to that high office, in the year 597, by Gregory the Great, bishop of Rome, with the consent of Ethelbert, king of Canterbury, he died in the year 611	John Philoponus John Malela Hefychius of Jerusalem Theophylact Simocatta Antiochus Modestus Cyrus of Alexandria Jonas Gallus John Moschus Andreas Damascenus George Pisides Eligius The two Theodores Paulus The Emp. Heraclius Maximus, Conf. Theodore, the Monk The Emp. Constantine II Martin, Bishop of Rome Maurus of Ravenna Anastasius, a Monk — a Rom. Presb. Fructuosus, Hisp. Peter, Metropolitan of Nicomedia Julian Pomerius Agatho John of Thessalonica Cresconius Ildefonsus Marculph Macarius John Climachus Fortunatus Venant. Isidore of Seville, who composed Commentaries on the Historical Books of the Old Testament, and is acknowledged to have been the principal Author of the famous Mosarabic Liturgy, which is the ancient Liturgy of Spain.	The ancient Heresies were still in vigour during this century; — to these were added the Paulicians, Monothelites.	An extraordinary progress is made in the conversion of the English. The Archbishoprics of London and York are founded, with each twelve Bishoprics under its jurisdiction — The Archbishopric of London is translated to Canterbury. The Gospel is propagated with success in Holland, Friesland, and Germany. The schism between the Greek and Latin churches commences in this century. The rise of Mahomet and the rapid progress of his religion, which is propagated by fire and sword, The Mahometan Era, called the Hegira, commences with the year of Christ 622. The destruction of the Persian monarchy, under the reign of Jздегерdes III. Boniface IV receives from the odious tyrant Phocas (who was the great patron of the popes and the chief promoter of their grandeur) the famous Pantheon, which is converted into a church. Here Cybele was succeeded by the Virgin Mary, and the Pagan deities by Christian martyrs. Idolatry still subsisted; but the objects of it were changed. Ina, king of the West-Saxons, resigns	The Author of the Alexandrian Chronicle. Isidore of Seville, who, besides his Theological productions, composed a History of the Goths and Vandals, and a work, entitled, Etymologicon Scientiarum, in which he gives an account of the origin and nature of the different sciences. In this century commenced that long period of ignorance and darkness which remained until the light of the Reformation arose.
<i>Kings of the Goths in Spain.</i>	Agatho 682 Leo II 684 Benedict II 685 John V. 686 Conon 687 Sergius I 701 A schism occasioned by the pretensions of Theodore and Paschalis.	619 Mellitus 624 Justus 634 Honorius 653 Adeodatus 664 Theodore 690 Brithwald				
<i>Kings of France.</i>	Clotaire II 628 Dagobert 638 Sigibert II } 654 Clovis } 660 Clotaire III 668 Childeric II 673 Dagobert II 679 Theodoric III 690 Clovis III 695 Childebert III					
<i>The race of the Idle Kings begins with Theodoric III, and ends with Childeric III.</i>						
<i>England.</i>						
<i>The Heptarchy</i>						
<i>Kings of the Lombards in Italy.</i>						
Agilulph 616						

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events.	Profane Authors.
Adaloaldus 626			Dorotheus		his crown and assumes the Monastic habit in a convent at Rome.	
Arioaldus 638			Sophronius, Bishop of Jerusalem		During the Heptarchy, many Saxon kings took the same religious turn.	
Rotharis 653					The Sixth General Council is held at Constantinople, under Constantine Pogonatus, against the Monothelites, in the year 680.	
Rodoald 656					The Seventh, which is looked upon by some as a kind of Supplement to this, was held in the Trullus, under Justinian II, in the year 692, and is called <i>Quinisextum</i> .	
Aripert 662						
Gondipert 662						
Grimoald 673						
Garibald 673						
Pertharit 689						
Cunipert 701						
Exarchs of Ravenna.						
Smaragdus 610						
John 615						
Eleutherius 617						
Isaac 643						
Theodorus Calliopas 649						
Olympius 650						
Theodorus Calliopas 686						
Theodorus 687						
Joannes Plato 702						

CENTURY VIII.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
Emperors of the East.	John VI 705	Britwald 731	Venerable Bede	The Eutychians, Monothelites, and Jacobites continue to propagate their doctrines.	Rapid progress of the Saracens in Asia and Africa.	Alcuin — see the first column.
A. D.	John VII 707	Tatwin 734	John Damascenus	The Paulonians, who were so called from their leaders Paul and John, and embraced the pernicious errors of Valentinian and Manes.	The downfall of the kingdom of the Lombards and of the exarchate of Ravenna, the latter of which is granted to the fee of Rome by Pepin, king of France.	Bede
Justinian II 711	Sisinnius 708	Nothelm 741	The anonymous author of a book, entitled, <i>Ordo Romanus de Divinis Officiis</i> , published in the Bibl. Patr.	The Paulonians, who were so called from their leaders Paul and John, and embraced the pernicious errors of Valentinian and Manes.	Charlemagne adds to the grant of Pepin several provinces; though the titles and acts of this grant have not been produced by the Roman-catholic historians.	Fredegarius
Philippicus 713	Constantine 714	Cuthbert 758	Romanus de Divinis Officiis, published in the Bibl. Patr.	The Paulonians, who were so called from their leaders Paul and John, and embraced the pernicious errors of Valentinian and Manes.	Charlemagne adds to the grant of Pepin several provinces; though the titles and acts of this grant have not been produced by the Roman-catholic historians.	John Damascenus
Anastasius II 714	Gregory II 731	Bregwin 762	Charlemagne, see the Capitularia, published by Baluzius at Paris, in the 1677, and the Codex Carolinus, published at Ingoldstat, in 1634, by Gretzer	The Paulonians, who were so called from their leaders Paul and John, and embraced the pernicious errors of Valentinian and Manes.	Charlemagne adds to the grant of Pepin several provinces; though the titles and acts of this grant have not been produced by the Roman-catholic historians.	George Synellus
Theodosius III 716	Gregory III 741	Lambert 790	Ambrosius Autbertus	The Paulonians, who were so called from their leaders Paul and John, and embraced the pernicious errors of Valentinian and Manes.	Charlemagne adds to the grant of Pepin several provinces; though the titles and acts of this grant have not been produced by the Roman-catholic historians.	Virgilius
Leo III Isaur. 741	Zachary 752	Athelard	The Popes, Gregory I, Gregory II, and Adrian Florus	The Paulonians, who were so called from their leaders Paul and John, and embraced the pernicious errors of Valentinian and Manes.	Charlemagne adds to the grant of Pepin several provinces; though the titles and acts of this grant have not been produced by the Roman-catholic historians.	
Constantine V Copron. 775	Stephen II 752			The Paulonians, who were so called from their leaders Paul and John, and embraced the pernicious errors of Valentinian and Manes.	Charlemagne adds to the grant of Pepin several provinces; though the titles and acts of this grant have not been produced by the Roman-catholic historians.	
Leo IV 780	Stephen III 757			The Paulonians, who were so called from their leaders Paul and John, and embraced the pernicious errors of Valentinian and Manes.	Charlemagne adds to the grant of Pepin several provinces; though the titles and acts of this grant have not been produced by the Roman-catholic historians.	
Constantine VI Porphy. 797	Paul 767			The Paulonians, who were so called from their leaders Paul and John, and embraced the pernicious errors of Valentinian and Manes.	Charlemagne adds to the grant of Pepin several provinces; though the titles and acts of this grant have not been produced by the Roman-catholic historians.	
Irene	A schism between Paul and Theophylact.			The Paulonians, who were so called from their leaders Paul and John, and embraced the pernicious errors of Valentinian and Manes.	Charlemagne adds to the grant of Pepin several provinces; though the titles and acts of this grant have not been produced by the Roman-catholic historians.	
Kings of the Visigoths in Spain.	Stephen IV 772			The Paulonians, who were so called from their leaders Paul and John, and embraced the pernicious errors of Valentinian and Manes.	Charlemagne adds to the grant of Pepin several provinces; though the titles and acts of this grant have not been produced by the Roman-catholic historians.	
Egica 700	A schism between Constantine, Philip, and Stephen IV.			The Paulonians, who were so called from their leaders Paul and John, and embraced the pernicious errors of Valentinian and Manes.	Charlemagne adds to the grant of Pepin several provinces; though the titles and acts of this grant have not been produced by the Roman-catholic historians.	
Vitiza 710				The Paulonians, who were so called from their leaders Paul and John, and embraced the pernicious errors of Valentinian and Manes.	Charlemagne adds to the grant of Pepin several provinces; though the titles and acts of this grant have not been produced by the Roman-catholic historians.	
Roderic, the last King of the Goths 713				The Paulonians, who were so called from their leaders Paul and John, and embraced the pernicious errors of Valentinian and Manes.	Charlemagne adds to the grant of Pepin several provinces; though the titles and acts of this grant have not been produced by the Roman-catholic historians.	

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
<i>Kings of Leon and the Asturias.</i>	Adrian 795 Leo III		Paul, the Lombard Paulinus, Bishop of Aquileia Alcuin, a native of England, and one of the principal instruments made use of by Charlemagne for the restoration of learning. He is considered by Dupin as the person that first introduced polite literature into France, and it is to him, that the Universities of Paris, Tours, Soissons, &c. owe their origin.	Adelbert Felix, Bishop of Urgella Elipand, Bishop of Toledo Leo, the Isaurian, who destroyed the images in the churches, and was the chief of Iconoclastes; and Clement, who preferred the decisions of Scripture before the Decrees of Councils, are reputed Heretics by the church of Rome.	narch, converted to Christianity. The Christians persecuted by the Saracens, who massacre five hundred Monks in the Abbey of Lerins. The Saracens take possession of Spain. Controversy between the Greek and Latin church, concerning the Holy Ghost's proceeding from the Son. The Germans converted by Boniface. The Gospel propagated in Hyrcania and Tartary.	
<i>Kings of France.</i> Childebert III 711 Dagobert III 715 Chilperic II 720 Theodoric IV 736 Interregnum, from the year 737 to 743, during which time Carloman and Pepin, sons of Charles Martel, govern without the regal title. Childeric III de-throned in 750 The last king of the First Race.			Felix, Archbishop of Ravenna Germanus, Bishop of Constantinople. The unknown Author of a book, entitled, Liber Diurnus Pontificum Romanorum. Egbert, Archbishop of York Bartholomew, a Monk of Edessa, who refuted the Alcoran.	Virgilius was also accused of heresy by Pope Zachary, because he was a good mathematician, and believed the existence of Antipodes. Those, who promoted the worship of images and relics, in this century, deserve much better the denomination of Heretics.	The right of election to the see of Rome conferred upon Charlemagne and his successors by Pope Adrian, in a council of bishops assembled at Rome. The worship of images authorized by the second council of Nice, in the year 787, which is improperly called the Seventh General Council.	
<i>Second Race.</i> Pepin 768 Charlemagne			Boniface, Archbishop of Mentz, commonly called the Apostle of Germany. Anastasius, Abbot in Palestine Theophanes Aldhelm, Bishop of Shireburn, under the Heptarchy and nephew to Ina king of the West-Saxons.		The reading of the Epistle and Gospel introduced into the service of the church. Solitary or private masses instituted. Churches built in honour of saints. Masses for the dead. Willebrod sent to convert the Frisians; he was the first bishop of Utrecht.	
<i>England.</i> The Heptarchy <i>Kings of the Lombards in Italy.</i> Luitpert 704 Ragumbert 704 Aripert 712 Ansprand 712 Luitprand 744 Rachis 750 Aistulphus 756 Desiderius 773 The kingdom of the Lombards, which subsisted during the space of 206 years, was overturned by CHARLEMAGNE, who, having defeated Desiderius, caused himself to be crowned king of						

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
<i>the Lombards, in the year 774.</i> <i>Exarchs of Ravenna.</i> Theophylact 710 Jo. Procopius 712 Paul 729 Eutychius 752 <i>The Exarchate subsisted during the space of 185 years. It ended in the reign of Aistulfus king of the Lombards, who reduced Ravenna, and added it to his dominions. But this prince was obliged by Pepin king of France to surrender the Exarchate with all its territories, castles, &c. to be forever held by Pope Stephen III and his successors in the see of Rome. This is the true foundation of the temporal grandeur of the popes.</i>						

CENTURY IX.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
<i>Emperors of the East.</i> A. D. Irene 802 Nicephorus 811 Saturatius 811 Michael Cyropolites 813 Leo Armen. 820 Michael Balb. 829 Theophilus 842 Michael III 867 Basilus I, Macedo 886 Leo VI, Philos.	Leo III 816 Stephen V 817 Paschal I 824 Eugenius II 827 <i>A schism between Eugenius II and Zizinnus.</i> Valentine 827 Gregory IV 844 Sergius II 847 Leo IV 855 Pope Joan Bened. III 858	Athelard 806 Wulfred 830 Theogild 830 Celnoth 871 Athelred 889 Plegmund	Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople. Amalaricus, Bishop of Trier Theodore Studita Agobard, Archbishop of Lyon Eginhart Claudius Clement, Bishop of Turin Jonas, Bishop of Orleans Freculph, Bishop of Lisieux	Paulicians, a branch of the Manicheans, Iconoclastes, Iconolatræ, or Image-worshippers. Predestinarians, Adoptians, Transubstantians, Clement, Bp. of Turin, who followed the sentiments of	The conversion of the Swedes, Danes, Saxons, Huns, Bohemians, Moravians, Slavonians, Russians, Indians, and Bulgarians, which latter occasions a controversy between the Greek and Latin churches. The rise of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass. The cause of Christianity suffers in the East under the Sa-	Photius Smaragdus Eginhart Rabanus Maurus Abbon Herempert Leon Sergius Methodius Walafridus Strabo John Scot Eri-gena Alfred, the Great, king of

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events—Religious Rites—	Profane Authors.
Emperors of the West. The Western Empire was restored, in the year 800, in favour of Charlemagne king of France. Charlemagne 814 Lewis, the Debonaire 840 Lothaire 855 Lewis II 875 Charles II, surnamed the Bald 877 Lewis III 879 Carloman 880 Charles III, deposed 887 After the death of this prince (who was the last king of France that was emperor) Germany and Italy were entirely separated from the French monarchy. Arnolph 899 Lewis IV Kings of Spain, i. e. of Leon and the Asturias. Alphonso, the Chaste 844 Ramiro 851 Ordogno 862 Alphonso III Kings of France. Charlemagne 814 Lewis, the Debonaire 840 Charles the Bald 877 Lewis III 879 Carloman 884 Charles III 888 Eudes 898 Charles the Simple Kings of England. The Heptarchy finished by the Union of the seven kingdoms under the government of Egbert.	A schism between Benedict and Anastasius. Nicholas I 867 Adrian II 872 John VIII 882 Marinus I 884 Adrian III 885 Formosus 897 A schism between Formosus and Sergius. Boniface VI 897 Stephen VII 901 A schism between Stephen VII, John IX, Romanus I and II, and Theodore II.		Moses Barcephala Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople Theod.-Abucara Petrus Siculus Nicetas David Rabanus Maurus, Archb. of Mentz Hilduin Servatus Lupus Drepanius Florus Druthmar Godeschalcus Paschasius Raderbert, the chief of the Transubstantians. Bertram or Ratram of Corby, who refuted the monstrous errors of Raderbert, and was at the head of those who denied the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt Walafridus Strabo Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims John Scot Eri-gena Ansegisus Florus Magister Prudens, Bishop of Troyes Remy of Lyons Nicholas Adrian John VIII, Pope Anastasius, Bibl. Auxilius Theodulph, Bp. of Orleans Smaragdus Aldric, Bishop of Mans Ado of Vienna Isidorus Mercator, author of the False Decretals. Jesse, Bishop of Amiens Dungale Halitgaire, Bishop of Cambrai Amulon, Archbishop of Lyons	Felix of Urgella.	racens, and in Europe under the Normans. The power of the pontiffs increases; that of the bishops diminishes; and the emperors are divested of their ecclesiastical authority. The Decretals are forged, by which the popes extended the limits of their jurisdiction and authority. The fictitious relics of St. Mark, St. James, and St. Bartholomew, are imposed upon the credulity of the people. Monks and abbots now first employed in civil affairs, and called to the courts of princes. The Festival of All-Saints is added, in this century, to the Latin Calendar by Gregory IV; though some authors of note place this institution in the seventh century, and attribute it to Boniface IV. The superstitious festival of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, instituted by the Council of Mentz, and confirmed by Pope Nicholas I, and afterwards by Leo X. The trial by cold water introduced by Pope Eugenius II; though Le Brun, in his <i>Histoire des Pratiques Superstitieuses</i>, endeavours to prove this ridiculous invention more ancient. The Emperor Lewis II is obliged, by the arrogant Pontif Nicholas I, to perform the functions of groom, and hold the bridle of this Pope's horse, while his pretended	England. His Saxon Version of Orosius was never published. Abou-Navas, an Arabian Poet The Calif Mamon, an eminent Mathematician and Astronomer. N. B. Haroun, the father of this prince sent to Charlemagne a striking clock, with springs and wheels, which was the first ever seen in France, and shews, that, at this period, the arts were more cultivated in Asia than in Europe. Albategni, the Mathematician Albumasar, the Arabian Astronomer

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
Egbert 837			Vandalbert		Holiness was dismounting	
Ethelwolf 857			Angelome		The Legends or Lives of the Saints began to be composed in this century.	
Ethelbald } 860			Epiphanes, Archbishop of Constantia in the Island of Cyprus.		The Apostle's Creed is sung in the churches — Organs, bells, and vocal music introduced in many places — Festivals multiplied.	
Ethelbert } 866			Herrie		The Order of St. Andrew, or the Knights of the Thistle, in Scotland.	
Ethelred 871			Reginon		Michael I, emperor of the East, abdicates the throne, and, with his wife and six children, retires into a monastery.	
Alfred the Great 899			Abbon		Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, excommunicates the pope.	
Kings of Scotland.			William, the Librarian		The canonisation of saints introduced by Pope Leo III.	
<i>The History of Scotland is divided into four great Periods. The first, which commences with Fergus I, 330 years before Christ, and contains a series of 68 kings, which ends with Alpinus, in the year 823, is looked upon as entirely fabulous. We shall therefore begin this chronological list with the second Period, which commences with</i>			Pope Formosus		The University of Oxford founded by Alfred.	
<i>Kennet II.</i>			Pope Stephen		The sciences are cultivated among the Saracens, and particularly encouraged by the Caliph Almamon.	
<i>Kennet II 854</i>			Methodius, who invented the Slavonian characters, and made a translation of the Bible for the Bulgarians, which was used by the Russians.		Theophilus, from his abhorrence of images, banishes the painters out of the Eastern Empire.	
<i>Donald V 858</i>			Alfred the Great, king of England, composed a Saxon Paraphrase on the Ecclesiastical History of Bede, a Saxon Version of Orosius, and a Saxon Psalter.		Harald, king of Denmark, is dethroned by his subjects on account of his attachment to Christianity.	
<i>Constantine II 874</i>			The Emperor Basilus, Mac.		The University of Paris founded.	
<i>Ethus 874</i>			The Emperor Leo, surnamed the Wise			
<i>Gregory 893</i>						
<i>Donald V</i>						
Kings of Sweden.						
<i>The origin of this kingdom is covered with uncertainty and fables. Some historians reckon 36 kings before Bior-no III, but it is with this latter prince, that chronologers generally begin their series.</i>						
<i>Bior-no III 824</i>						
<i>Brantamond 827</i>						
<i>Sivard 842</i>						
<i>Heroth 856</i>						
<i>Charles VI 868</i>						
<i>Bior-no IV 883</i>						
<i>Ingo, or Ingelde 891</i>						

CENTURY X.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
Emperors of the East.	John IX 905 <i>A schism between</i>	Plegmund 917	Simeon - Metaphrastes	Now new Heresies were invented during this century. That of the Anthropomorphites was revived, and the greatest part of the others were continued.	Irruption of the Huns into Germany, and of the Normans into France.	This century, by way of eminence, is styled the age of barbarism and ignorance. The greatest part of the Ecclesiastical and Theological Authors mentioned in the column were mean, ignorant, and trivial writers, and wrote upon mean and trivial subjects. At the head of the learned men of this age we must place Gerbert, otherwise known by the papal denomination of Sylvester II. This learned pontiff endeavoured to revive the drooping sciences, and the effects of his zeal were visible in this, but still more in the following century.
A. D.	John IX 905	Athelm 924	Leontius of Byzantium		The Danes invade England.	
Leo, the Philosopher 911	Benedict IV 906	Odo 957	Odo of Cluny		The Moors enter into Spain.	
Alexander 912	Leo V 906	Dunstan 988	Ratherius, Bishop of Verona and Liege		The Hungarians and several Northern nations converted to Christianity.	
Constantine VII surnamed Porphyrogen. 959	<i>A schism between</i> Leo V and Christopher.	Ethelgar 988	Hippolytus, the Theban		The Pirate Rollo is made duke of Normandy, and embraces the Christian faith.	
Romanus Lecapenus took advantage of the youth of this prince and seized the Imperial throne, but was disposed by his son Stephen, and died in 948	Christopher 907 <i>A schism between</i> Christopher and Sergius.	Siricius 993	Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury	Thus we find Nestorians, Eutychians, Paulicians, Armenians, Anthropomorphites, and Manichæans, making a noise in this century.	The Poles are converted to Christianity under Micislaus, in the year 965.	
Romanus, first or second son to Constantine VII 963	Sergius III 910	Aluric or Alfric	Rutychius, Patriarch of Alexandria		The Christian religion is established in Muscovy, Denmark, and Norway.	
Nicephorus Phoc. 970	Anastasius III 912		Sajdus, Patriarch of Alexandria		The plan of the Holy war is formed, in this century, by Pope Sylvester II.	
John Zimisces 975	Lando 912		Flodoard		The baptism of bells; the festival in remembrance of departed souls; the institution of the Rosary; and a multitude of superstitious rites, shocking to common sense and an insult upon true religion, are introduced in this century.	
Basilus III } Constantine VIII }	John X 928		Joseph Genesius			
	Leo VI 929		Atto, Bishop of Vercell			
	Stephen VIII 931		Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury			
	John XI 936		Luitprand			
	Leo VII 939		Abbo of Fleury			
	Stephen IX 943		Notker, Bishop of Liege			
	Marinus II 946		Suidas			
Emperors of the West.	Agapetus II 955		Roswida, a Poetess			
Lewis IV 912	John XII 964		Edgar, King of England			
Conrad I 919	<i>A schism between</i> John XII and Leo.		Ælfridus			
Henry I, surnamed the Fowler 936	Leo VIII 965		Heriger			
Otho I 973	Benedict V 965		Olympiodorus			
Otho II 983	John XIII 972		Cæcumenius			
Otho III	Donus II 972		Odilo			
	Benedict VI 975		Burchard			
Kings of Spain, i. e. Leon and the Asturias.	Boniface VII 984		Valerius of Astorga in Spain. His lives of the Fathers, very different from those that are published, are still in Ms. in the Library of Toledo.			
Alphonso III, surnamed the Great, abdicates the crown in the year 910	Benedict VII 984		John Malela			
Garcias 913	John XIV 985		Constantine Porphyrogenetes			
Ordogno II 923	John XV 985		John of Capua			
	John XVI 996		Nichoias, Patriarch			
	Gregory V 999					
	<i>A schism between</i> John					

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
Froila II 924	and Gregory V.		ach of Constanti- nople		The influence and power of the Monks increase greatly in England.	brated Ara- bian Chemist and Physician.
Alphonso IV 931	Sylvester II		Gregory of Ca- sarea		The kingdom of Italy is united by Otto to the German Empire.	Leontius, one of the Byzantine Historians
Ramiro II 950			Georges			Joseph Gene- sius.
Ordogno III 955			Epiphanes			
Sanchez the Fat 964			Severus			
Ramiro III 982			Moses Bar-Cepha			
Bermudo, called, by some, Veremond II 999			Alfric, Archbishop of Canterbury			
Alphonso V			Gerbert, Pope			
			Oswald			
			Sifinnius			
<i>Kings of France</i>					Arithmetical figures are brought from Arabia into Europe by the Saracens.	
Charles the Simple 929					The Empire of Germany is rendered elective by Otto III.	
Ralph, usurps the throne						
Lewis d'outreme-re 954						
Lothaire II 986						
Lewis the Idler, the last king of the line of Charlemagne 987						
<i>Third Race.</i>						
Hugh Capet 996						
Robert						
<i>Kings of England.</i>						
Edward 925						
Athelstan 941						
Edmund 946						
Edred 955						
Edwy 957						
Edgar 975						
Edward 978						
Ethelred						
<i>Kings of Scotland.</i>						
Donald V 903						
Constantine III 943						
Malcolm I 958						
Indulfus 967						
Duffus 972						
Cullen 976						
Kenneth III 994						
Constantine IV 995						
Grimus						
<i>Kings of Sweden.</i>						
Ingeld II 907						
Eric VI 926						
Eric VII 940						
Eric VIII 980						
Olaus II, the Tributary						

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics.	Remarkable Events— Religious Rites—	Profane Authors.
<i>The beginnings of the Danish monarchy are so fabulous, that we shall begin with Harold, who first embraced the Christian religion.</i> Harold VI 980 Sweyn <i>Poland.</i> Micillas, the first Christian Duke, dies 999						

CENTURY XI.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events— Religious Rites—	Profane Authors.
<i>Emperors of the East.</i> A. D. Basilus III } 1025 Constantine VIII } 1028 Romanus II, Argyr. 1034 Michael IV, Paphl. 1041 Michael V, Calaphates 1041 Constantine IX, Monomach. 1054 Theodora 1056 Michael VI, Strat. 1057 Isaac I, Comen. 1059 Constantine X, Ducas 1067 Romanus III, Diogenes 1071 Nicephorus II, Botoniates 1081 Alexis I, Comnen. 1081 <i>Emperors of the West.</i> Otho III 1002 Henry II 1024 Conrad II 1039	Sylvester II 1003 John XVII 1003 John XVIII 1009 Sergius IV 1012 Benedict VII 1024 <i>A schism between Gregory and Benedict.</i> John XIX 1033 Benedict IX 1044 <i>A schism between the two Johns and Benedict.</i> Gregory VI 1046 Clement II 1048 Damasus II 1049 Leo IX 1054 Victor II 1057 Stephen IX 1059 Benedict X 1059	Aluric or Alfric 1006 Elphegus, massacred by the Danes in the year 1012 Livingus 1020 Agelnoth 1038 Eadfinus 1050 Robert Gemetic. 1052 Stigand 1069 Lanfranc 1089 Anselm	Dithmar, Bishop of Mersebourg Leo, the Grammarian Aimon Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres Adelbold, Bishop of Utrecht Alexius, Patriarch of Constantinople Bernon of Augsburg Ademar The Bruno's Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury Theophanes Cerameus Nilus Doxopatrius Michael Pfellus Michael Cerularius Simeon, the Younger Theophylact, a Bulgarian Cardinal Humbert Petrus Damianus	Berenger, famous for his opposition to the monstrous doctrine of Transubstantiation. Roscelin, a Tritheite A sect of French Manicheans condemned in the council of Orleans.	The Crusades are carried on with all the enormities, that usually attend a blind, extravagant, and inhuman zeal. Godfrey of Bouillon takes possession of Jerusalem in the year 1099. A contest between the Emperors and Popes, in which the latter discover a most arrogant and despotic spirit. The dignity of Cardinal is first instituted in this century. The Moors are driven, by degrees, from several parts of Spain; hence arose the division of that country into so many little kingdoms. Mathilda, daughter of Boniface, duke of Tuscany, leaves all her possessions to the church of Rome, in consequence of her passionate attachment	Leo, the Grammarian Adelbord Michael Pfellus Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury Gui Aretine, the inventor of Musical Notes Wippo John Scylitzes Avicenna, an Arabian Philosopher Stephen, the first Christian King of Hungary Alphes, a Jew Josippon, or the false Josephus Ferdousi, a Persian Poet Roscelin John, the Philosopher John Curopalata, one of the Byzantine Historians

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
Henry III 1056	Nicholas II 1061		Marianus Scotus		to Hildebrand, otherwise known by the papal name of Gregory VII, with whom he lived in a licentious commerce.	
Henry IV			Anselm, Archb. of Cantertury		Sicily, Castile, Poland, and Hungary, are erected into kingdoms.	
<i>Kings of Spain, i. e. of Leon and the Asturias.</i>	<i>A schism between Nicholas II and Benedict.</i>		Ivo, Bishop of Chartres		The kingdom of Burgundy and Arles is transferred to the Emperor Conrad II, by Rodolphus king of Burgundy.	
Alphonso 1027	Alexander II 1073		Hildebert, Archb. of Tours		Several of the popes are looked upon as Magicians, — as, in these times of darkness, learning, and more especially philosophy and mathematics, were looked upon as magic.	
Veremond III 1037	<i>A schism between Alexander II and Cadalous.</i>		Pope Gregory VII		<i>Investitures</i> introduced in this century; see vol. i. p. 506.	
<i>Kings of Leon and Castile united.</i>	Gregory VII 1086		Gerhard		The tyranny of the popes is nobly opposed by the Emperors Henry I, II, and III, by William I king of England, and other monarchs of that nation, by Philip king of France and by the British and German churches.	
Ferdinand I, surnamed the Great 1065	<i>A schism between Gregory VII and Guy Bishop of Ravenna.</i>		Hugh of Breteuil		Baptism is performed by triple immersion.	
Sancho II 1073	Victor III 1088		Berthold		The Sabbath-Fasts is introduced by Gregory VII.	
Alphonso VI	Urban II 1099		Hermannus Contract.		The Cistercian, Carthusian, and Whipping Orders, with many others, are founded in this century.	
<i>Kings of France.</i>			Peter, Patriarch of Antioch		The Emperor Henry IV goes barefooted to the insolent Pontif Gregory VII at Canusum, and does homage to this spiritual tyrant in the most ignominious manner, the same emperor, however, besieges	
Robert 1031			Glaber Radulphus			
Henry I 1060			Deoduinus, Bishop of Leigh			
Philip I			Adelman			
<i>Kings of England.</i>			Nicetas Pectoratus			
Ethelred 1016			Leo of Bulgaria			
Edmond, Ironf. 1017			Constant. Guitmundus			
Canute the Great, king of Denmark 1035			Manasses, Archb. of Rheims			
Harold, Haref. 1039			John, Patriarch of Antioch			
Hardicanute 1041			Sigefrid			
Edward the Confessor 1066			Samonus of Gaza			
Harold 1066			Samuel of Morocco, a converted Jew			
<i>Norman Line.</i>			John Xiphilinus			
William the Conqueror 1087			Lambert			
William Rufus 1100			<i>A famous, but anonymous work, called Micrologus.</i>			
<i>Kings of Scotland.</i>			Adam of Bremen			
Grimus 1003			John Curopalata			
Malcolm II 1033			Benno of Ravenna			
Donald VII, by some called Duncan 1040			Nicholas of Methone			
Macbeth 1057			Philip, the Solitary			
Malcolm III 1093			Othlon of Fulda			
Donald VIII de-throned 1094			Tangmar			
Duncan II 1096			Gui Aretin			
Donald again 1097			Eugesippus			
<i>Kings of Sweden.</i>			Dominick of Grado			
Olaus II 1019			Guitmond			
Asmund 1035			Alberic			
Asmundslem 1041			Osborn, a Monk of Canterbury			

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events— Religious Rites—	Profane Authors.
Hakon 1059 Stenchil 1061 Ingo III 1064 Halstan 1080 Philip					Rome soon after, and makes a noble stand against the pontif. Doomsday-book is compiled from a survey of all the estates in England. Jerusalem is taken by the Crusaders.	
<i>Kings of Denmark.</i>						
Sweyn 1014 Canut the Great, king of England 1035 Harold 1040 Hardicanute 1041 Magnus 1048 Sweyn II 1074 Harold VII 1085 St. Canut 1086 Olaus III 1086 Eric III						
<i>Kings of Poland.</i>						
Boleslaus first king 1025 Miecslaus 1034						
<i>Interregnum.</i>						
Casimir 1058 Boleslaus II 1079 Ladislaus						
<i>Kings of Jerusalem.</i>						
Godfrey, chosen king in 1099 dies in 1100 Baldwin I						

CENTURY XII.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events— Religious Rites—	Profane Authors.
<i>Emperors of the East.</i> A. D. Alexius I, Comnen. 1118 John II, Comnen. 1143 Emanuel Comnen. 1180 Alexius II, Comnen. 1183	<i>Antipopes,</i> Paschal II 1118 Clement, Albrecht, Theodore, and Maginulph. Gelafius II 1119 Calistus II 1124 Honorius II 1130	Anselm 1109 Rodolphus 1122 William Corbeil 1136 Theobald 1168 Thomas Becket 1170 Richard 1183 Baldwin 1191	Gilbert, Abbot of Westminster Guibert Sigebert of Gemblours Peter Alphonso Odo of Orleans Godfrey of Vendome Rupert of Dyits Baldric	<i>The Bogomiles and Catharists were a kind of Manichæans.</i> <i>The Pasagini-ans were a kind of Arians, who also discovered</i>	<i>The Sclavonians and the inhabitants of the island of Rugen receive the light of the Gospel, and their example is followed by the Livonians and Finlanders.</i> <i>The state of affairs in Asiatic Tartary changes in fa-</i>	Robert Bacon Anselm of Laon Vaccarius Leoninus, the supposed introducer of Latin Rhymes. Roger Hoveden John of Salisbury

<i>Sovereign Princes.</i>	<i>Popes or Bishops of Rome.</i>	<i>Archbishops of Canterbury.</i>	<i>Ecclesiastical and Theologic Writers.</i>	<i>Heretics real or reputed.</i>	<i>Remarkable Events—Religious Rites—</i>	<i>Profane Authors.</i>
Andronicus Comnen. 1185	Innocent II 1143	Reginald Fitz-jocelin 1191	Arnulph, Bishop of Lisieux	a strange attachment to the ceremonial law of Moses.	vour of the Christians, by the elevation of Prester John.	William of Somerset
Isaac II, Ang. 1195	Celestine II 1144	Hubert Walter	Bernard of Clairval	Eon, a madman, rather than a heretic.	The Crusade is renewed.	John Zonaras
Alexius III, Ang. or Comnen.	Lucius II 1145		Abelard	The same thing may be said of Tanquelinus.	The kingdom of Jerusalem is overturned, and the affairs of the Christians in Palestine decline.	George Cedrenus
<i>Emperors of the West.</i>	Eugenius III 1153		Æthelred	As to Arnold of Brescia, the Petrobrussians, Henricians, Waldenses, and Apostolics, if allowance be made for some few points, they rather deserve the title of REFORMERS and WITNESSES to the TRUTH, than that of Heretics.	A Third Crusade undertaken.	John Cinnamus
Henry IV 1106	Anastasius IV 1154		Baldwin, Archb. of Canterbury		The three famous military Orders instituted, viz. The Knights of St. John of Jerusalem—The Knights Templars—The Teutonic Knights of St. Mary.	Silvester Girald, Bishop of St. David's
Henry V 1125	Adrian IV 1159		Euthymius Zigab.		The original MS. of the famous Pandect of Justinian is discovered in the ruins of Amalphi, or Melfi, when that city was taken by Lotharius II, in 1137, and this emperor makes a present of it to the city of Pisa, whose fleet had contributed, in a particular manner, to the success of the siege.	Godfrey of Viterbo
Lotharius II 1138	Alexander III 1181		William of Somerset		The contest between the emperors and popes is renewed under Frederick Barbarossa and Adrian IV. —The insolence of the popes excessive.	William of Newburgh, an English Historian
Conrad III 1152	Lucius III 1185		John of Salisbury		Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, assassinated before the altar, while he was at Vespers in his cathedral.	Pelagius, Bp. of Oviedo
Frederic I, surnamed Barbarossa 1190	Gregory VIII 1188		Thomas Becket, Archb. of Canterbury		The scandalous traffic of indulgences begun by the bishops, and soon after monopolized by the popes.	John of Milan, author of the poem, called, Schola Salernitana
Henry VI 1197	Clement III 1191		Gervais, a Monk of Canterbury		The Scholastic Theology, whose jargon did such mischief in the church, had its rise in this century.	Robert Pullen, an English Cardinal
Philip	Celestine III 1199		Nicephorus of Brienne		The seeds of the Reformation sown, in this century, by the	Abraham Aben-Ezra
<i>Kings of Spain, i. e. of Leon and Castile.</i>			Anselm, Bishop of Havelb.			John and Isaac Tzetzes
Alphonso VI 1109			Jo. Zonaras			Henry of Huntington
Alphonso VII 1137			Mich. Glycas			Nicetas
Alphonso VIII 1157			Hug. Victorinus			Wernier
Sancho III 1158			Eadmerus			Moses Maimonides
Ferdinand II 1175			George Cedrenus			Anvari, a Persian Astronomer
Alphonso IX			Peter, the Venerable			Portius Azo
<i>Kings of France.</i>			Honorius of Autun			Nestor, a Russian Historian
Philip I 1108			Foucher			Falcandus
Lewis VI, surnamed the Gross 1137			Alger			Benjamin de Tudela, a Spanish Jew, whose Travels were translated by Barattier
Lewis VII, surnamed the Young 1180			Gratian			Averroes
Philip Aug.			Peter Lombard			Eustathius, Bp. of Thessalonica
<i>Kings of England.</i>			Henry of Huntington			Salomon Jarchi
Henry I 1135			William, Bishop of Rheims			Alhasen, an Arabian, who composed a large work on Optics
Stephen 1154			Constantine Harman.			
Henry II 1189			Orderic. Vital			
Richard I 1199			Constantine Manass.			
John			Zacharias Chrysop.			
<i>Kings of Scotland.</i>			Peter of Blois			
Edgar 1106			Peter Comestor.			
Alexander 1124			Peter de Celles			
David 1153			Peter of Poitiers			
Malcolm IV 1165			John Cinnamus			
William			John Belet			
<i>Kings of Sweden.</i>			Helmold			
Philip 1110			Gislebert, Bishop of London			
Ingo IV 1129			Stephen Harding			
Ragwald 1140			George Xiphilin.			
			Alexand. Arist.			
			Godfrey of Viterbo			
			Theod. Balsamon.			

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events— Religious Rites—	Profane Au- thors.
Magnus <i>deposed</i> in 1148			Richard of St. Victor.		Waldenses and other eminent men in Eng- land and France.	George El- macin, au- thor of the
Suercher 1160			William of Aux- erre.		Pope Paschal II or- ders the Lord's sup- per to be administred only in one kind, and retrenches the cup.	History of the Saracens, translated by
Eric, the Holy 1161			Bruno of Ast.		The Canon-Law formed into a body, by Gratian.	Erpenius.
Charles VII 1168			Simeon of Dur- ham.		Academical degrees introduced in this century.	Jeffrey of Mon- mouth
Canute 1192					Learning revived and encouraged in the University of Cam- bridge.	Henry of Hunt- ington
Suercher II						
<i>Kings of Den- mark.</i>						
Eric II 1101						
Nicholas 1135						
Eric III 1138						
Eric IV 1147						
Sweyn IV } 1155						
Canute V }						
Valdemar 1182						
Canute VI						
<i>Kings of Poland.</i>						
Uladislaus 1102						
Boleslaus III 1139						
Uladislaus II 1146						
Boleslaus IV 1173						
Micislaus 1178						
Casimir II 1195						
Lescus						
<i>Kings of Jerusa- lem.</i>						
Baldwin I 1118						
Baldwin II 1131						
Foulques 1141						
Baldwin III 1162						
Almeric 1173						
Baldwin IV 1185						
Baldwin V 1186						
Guy of Lusignan						
Jerusalem was re- taken by the In- fidels in 1187						
Almeric, from 1196 to 1205						
<i>Kings of Portugal.</i>						
Alphonso I, pro- claimed king in 1139						
dies in 1185						
Sancho I						

CENTURY XIII.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
<i>Emperors of the East.</i>	Innocent III 1216	Hub. Walter 1204	Joachim	The Waldenses	The Mahometan religion triumphs over Christianity in China and the Northern parts of Asia, by flattering the passions of voluptuous princes.	Roger Bacon, one of the great restorers of learning and philosophy
A. D.	Honorius III 1226	Steph. Langton 1228	John, Bishop of Macedonia	Nestorians	A papal embassy is sent to the Tartars by Innocent IV.	Saxo Grammaticus
Alexius III dethroned in 1203	Gregory IX 1241	Richard Werthesford 1231	Demetrius Chomatenus	Jacobites	A Fourth Crusade is undertaken by the French and Venetians, who make themselves masters of Constantinople, with a design to restore the throne to Isaac Angelus, who had been dethroned by his brother Ducas.	Walter of Coventry
Alexius IV dethroned in 1204	Celestine IV 1243	St. Edmund 1242	Mark, Patriarch of Alexandria	The Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit, otherwise called Beghards and Beguttes, Beghins and Turlupins.	The Emperor Isaac is put to death in a sedition, and his son Alexius strangled by Alexius Ducas, the ring-leader of this faction.	Alexander of Paris, the founder of French poetry
Alexius Ducas, surnamed Murzuphle 1204	Innocent IV 1254	Boniface 1270	Malachy, Archb. of Ardmagh	Amalric	The Crusaders take Constantinople a second time, dethrone Ducas, and elect Baldwin Count of Flanders, Emperor of the Greeks.	Villehardoin, an Historian
<i>Latin Emperors of the East residing at Constantinople.</i>	Alexander IV 1261	Robert Kilwardby 1278	Nicetas Choniata	Joachim	The empire of Franks in the East, which had subsisted fifty-seven years, is overturned by Michael Palaeologus.	Accursi of Florence
Baldwin I 1205	Urban IV 1264	John Peckham 1291	Francois d'Assise	Wilhelmina	A Fifth Crusade — which is carried on by the confederate arms of Italy and Germany.	Kimchi, a Spanish Jew
Henry 1216	Clement IV 1268	Robert Winchelsey	Alan de l'Isle	The sect of the Apostles.	Damietta, taken — but soon after retaken.	Conrad de Lichtenaw
Peter 1221	Gregory X 1276		Jacobus de Vitriaco	John of Parma, author of the Everlasting Gospel.	The fleet of the Crusaders ruined by the Saracens.	John Holywood, called De sacro bosco, author of the Sphæra Mundi.
Robert 1229	Innocent V 1276		Peter, the Monk	John of Parma, author of the Everlasting Gospel.	The Fifth Crusade undertaken by Lewis IX, who retakes Damietta, is afterwards reduced, with his ar-	John Holywood, called De sacro bosco, author of the Sphæra Mundi.
Baldwin II 1261	Adrian V 1276		Anthony of Padua	John of Parma, author of the Everlasting Gospel.		Actuarius, a Greek Physician
<i>Greek Emperors residing at Nice.</i>	John XX 1277		Germanus			Rod. Ximenes, Archbishop of Toledo
Theodore Lascaris 1222	Nicholas III 1280		Cæsarius			Michael Coniat, Bishop of Athens
John Ducas III 1255	Martin IV 1285		William of Paris			Ivel
Theodore Lascaris 1259	Honorius IV 1288		Raymon of Penafort			Rigord, an Historian
John Lascaris IV 1259	Nicholas IV 1292		Alexander de Hales			Pierre de Vignes
Michael Palaeologus retakes Constantinople in the year 1261, and thus unites in his person the Latin and Greek Empires, he dies in 1283	Celestine V 1294		Edmund Rich, Archb. of Canterbury			Matthew Paris
Andronicus II			Thomas of Spalatro			Suffridus
<i>Emperors of the West.</i>			John Peckham, Archb. of Canterbury			Sozomene, author of the Universal Chronology, which is yet in Mss. in the possession of the Regular
Philip 1208			Roger Bacon			
Otho IV 1218			Albert, the Great			
Frederick II 1250			Robert Grosseteste			
<i>Civil wars and an Interregnum, during which Conrad of Suabia, William count of Holland, Richard king of England,</i>			Vincent de Beauvais			
			Robert Sorbon			
			George Acropolita			
			Hugo de St. Caro			
			George Metochita			
			Guillaume de St. Amour			
			Nicephorus Blem			
			Thomas Aquinas			
			Bonaventura			
			Gilbert of Tournay			
			John of Paris, an opposer of Transubstantiation and Papal Tyranny.			

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events—Religious Rites—	Profane Authors.
Alphonso of Spain, Ottocar of Bohemia, appear on the scene of action.			John Beccus		my, to the greatest extremities,—dies of the plague in a second Crusade, and is canonised.	<i>Canons of Fiesoli, near Florence.</i>
Rodolphus of Hapsburg is elected Emperor, and dies in 1291			Theodore Laccaris		The Knights of the Teutonic Order, under command of Herman de Saltza, conquer and convert to Christianity the Prussians, at the desire of Conrad duke of Massovia.	Barthol. Cotton of Norwich; see Wharton's <i>Anglia Sacra</i> .
Adolphus of Nassau 1298			Arsenius		Christianity is propagated among the Arabians in Spain.	Engelbert Tho. Wicke, an English Historian
Albert I			George Pachymer		The philosophy of Aristotle triumphs over all the systems that were in vogue before this century.	Vitellio, a <i>Pa-lyst Mathem.</i>
Kings of Spain, i. e. of Leon and Castile.			George the Cyprian		The power of creating Bishops, Abbots, &c. is claimed by the Roman pontiffs, whose wealth and revenues are thereby greatly augmented.	Albert, the Great
Alphonso IX 1214			Stephen Langton, Archb. of Canterbury		John, king of England, excommunicated by Pope Innocent III, is guilty of the basest compliances through his slavish fear of that insolent pontif.	Colonna, Archb. bishop of Messina
Henry I 1217			Robert Capito		The <i>Inquisition</i> established in Narbonne Gaul, and committed to the direction of Dominic and his Order who treat the Waldenses and other reputed heretics with the most inhuman cruelty.	Michael Scot, the translator of Aristotle
Ferdinand III 1252			Thomas Cantimpr		The adoration of the Host is introduced by Pope Honorius III.	Gregory Abufaraius
Alphonso X 1284			Richard Middleton		The <i>Magna Charta</i> is signed by King John and his barons on the 15 th of June at Runnemed, near Windsor.	Foscarari of Bologna
Sancho IV 1295			William Durand		A debate arises between the Dominicans and Franciscans concerning the <i>Immaculate Conception</i> of the Virgin Mary.	Alphonso, king of Castile
Ferdinand IV			Egidius de Columna		Jubilees instituted	Cavalcanti of Florence
Kings of France.			Guil. Peraldus			Dinus, a famous Jurist.
Philip Aug. 1223			Martin Polon.			Marco Paoio, a Venetian, whose travels in China are curious.
Lewis VIII 1226			Raymond Martin			Francis Barberini, an Italian Poet
Lewis IX <i>sainted</i> 1270			Gregory Alufaraius			
Philip III the Hardy 1285			Jacob de Voragine			
Philip IV the Fair			Guillaume de Seignelai, Bishop of Auxerre			
Kings of England.			William of Auvergne, Bishop of Paris			
John 1216			Henry of Ghent			
Henry III 1272			Pope Boniface VIII			
Edward I						
Kings of Scotland.						
William 1214						
Alexander II 1249						
Alexander III 1286						
Interregnum.						
John Baliol						
Kings of Sweden.						
Suercher II 1211						
Eric X 1218						
Jean I 1222						
Eric XI 1250						
Waldemar 1276						
Magnus 1290						
Birger						
Kings of Denmark.						
Canute VI 1202						
Waldemar II 1241						
Eric VI 1250						

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Au- thors.
Abel 1252					by Pope Boniface VIII.	
Christopher 1259					The Sicilian Vespers, — when the	
Eric VII 1286					French in Sicily, to	
Eric VIII					the number of 8000,	
					were massacred in one	
Kings of Poland.					evening at a signal	
Lescus V 1203					given by John Pro-	
Uladislaus III					chyta, a Sicilian no-	
1226					bleman.	
Boleslaus V 1279					Conrad, duke of	
Lescus VI 1289					Suabia, and Frederick	
Boleslaus, Henry					of Austria, beheaded	
and Uladislaus,					at Naples by the	
take the title of					counsel of Pope Cle-	
Governors.					ment IV.	
Premislaus 1296					The Jews are dri-	
Uladislaus IV de-					ven out of France by	
posed in 1300					Lewis IX, and all the	
Wincellaus, king					copies of the Talmud,	
of Bohemia					that could be found,	
					are burnt.	
Kings of Portugal.					The college of e-	
Sancho I 1212					lectors founded in the	
Alphonso II 1223					empire.	
Sancho II 1246					The association of	
Alphonso III					the Hans-Towns.	
1279					The Dominicans,	
Denis					Franciscans, Servites,	
					Mendicants, and the	
					Hermits of St. Au-	
					gustin, date the ori-	
					gin of their Orders	
					from this century.	
					The fables con-	
					cerning the Removal	
					of the chapel of Lo-	
					retto; the Vision of	
					Sim. Stockius; the	
					Wandering Jew; and	
					St. Anthony's obliging	
					an ass to adore the	
					sacrament, are in-	
					vented about this	
					time.	
					The Festivals of	
					the Nativity of the	
					Blessed Virgin, and	
					of the Holy Sacra-	
					ment or Body of	
					Christ instituted.	
					The present House	
					of Austria take their	
					rise in this century.	
					Wales is conquered	
					by Edward, and u-	
					nited to England.	
					There is an unin-	
					terrupted succession of	
					English parliaments	
					from the year 1293.	

CENTURY XIV.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
<i>Emperors of the East.</i>	Boniface VIII 1303	Robert Winchelsey 1313	Nicephorus Callistus	Waldenses.	Fruitless attempts made to renew the Crusades.	Dante, the principal restorer of Philosophy and Letters, and also one of the most sublime Poets of modern times.
A. D.	Benedict XI 1314	Walter Raynold 1327	Raymond Lully	Palamites,	Christianity encouraged in Tartary and China; but loses ground towards the end of this century.	Petrarch
Andronicus II 1332	Clement V 1316	Simon Me-pham 1333	Matthæus Blastares	Hefycasts, and Quietists,	The Lithuanians and Jagello their prince converted to the Christian faith in the year 1386.	Boccace
Andronicus the Younger 1341	John XXI 1334	J. Stratford 1348	Barlaam	three different names for one sect.	Many of the Jews are compelled to receive the Gospel.	Chaucer
John Cantacuzenus usurps the government under John Palæologus, and holds it till the year 1355.	<i>A schism between Peter and John.</i>	Tho. Bradwardin 1349	Greg. Acindynus	Spiritual Franciscans.	Philosophy and Grecian literature are cultivated with zeal in this century.	Matthew of Westminster
John VI, Palæol. 1390	Benedict XII 1342	Simon Islip 1365	John Cantacuzenus	Ceccus Asculanus, who was burnt at Florence by the Inquisition, for making some experiments in mechanics that appeared miraculous to the vulgar.	The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	Nicholas Treveth
Andronicus IV 1392	Clement VI 1352	Simon Sudbury 1381	Nicephorus Greg.	Andrew of New-castle	Philip the Fair, king of France, opposes with spirit the tyrannic pretensions of the pope to a temporal jurisdiction over kings and princes, and demands a general council to depose Boniface VIII, whom he accuses of Heresy, Simony, and several enormities.	Nicephorus
Emanuel II	Innocent VI 1362	W. Courtney 1396	John Duns Scotus	Francis Mayron Durand of St. Portian	The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	Gregoras, the compiler of the Byzantine History.
<i>Emperors of the West.</i>	Urban V 1372	Thomas Arundel	Nicholas de Lyra	Nicholas de Lyra	The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	Theodore Metochita
Albert I 1308	<i>A schism between Urban and Clement.</i>		John Bacon	Echard.	The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	Guillaume de Nangis, Historian
Henry VII, Luxen. 1313	Gregory XI 1378		William Occam	Johan. de Mercuria.	The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	Henry Stero, Historian
Lewis V, Bav. 1347	<i>The death of Gregory XI occasioned that violent schism that threw the Western church into the utmost confusion. The church of Rome had two Popes, one residing at Rome, the other at Avignon.</i>		Nicholas Triveth	Beghards, and Beguines.	The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	Dinus Mugelanus
Charles IV 1378	<i>At Rome.</i>		Andrew Horne	As to the Cellites or Lollards they cannot be esteemed Heretics.	The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	Evrard, Hist.
Wenceslaus 1400	Urban VI 1389		Richard Bury	The followers of John Wickliff deserve an eminent place, with their leader, in the list of Reformers.	The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	Hayton, an Armenian Historian
Kings of Spain, i. e. Leon and Castile.	Boniface IX		Walter Burley	Nicholas of Calabria.	The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	Albertino Muscato
Ferdinand IV 1312	<i>At Avignon.</i>		Richard Hampole	Martin Gon-salve.	The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	Orderick de Forli
Alphonso XI 1350	Clement VII. not acknowledged 1394		Robert Holkot	Reghard Bartoldus de Rorbach.	The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	Lupold, Bishop of Bamberg
Pedro the Cruel 1369	Benedict XIII		Thomas Bradwardin, Archb. of Canterbury	The Dancers.	The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	Peter of Duis-bourg, an Historian
Henry II 1379			John Wickliff		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	Albert of Strasbourg, an Historian
John I 1390			Thomas Stubbs		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	Barlaam of Calabria, Master of Petrarch
Henry III			John de Burgo		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	Joinville
<i>Kings of France.</i>			William Wolfort		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	Peter de Ap- no, Physician and Astronom.
Philip the Fair 1314			The last thirteen all English authors.		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
Lewis X, Hutin 1316			Peter Aureolus		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
Philip V 1321			John Bassolis		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
Philip VI, Valois 1350			Bernard Guido		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
John 1364			Alvarus Pelagius		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
Charles V 1380			Theophanes, Bp. of Nice		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
Charles VI			Philotheus		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
<i>Kings of England.</i>			Antonius Andreas		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
Edward I 1307			Herveus Natalis		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
			Thomas of Strasbourg		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
			Raynerius of Pisa		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
			John of Fribourg		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
			Pope Clement VI		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
			Thomas Joylius		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
			John of Naples		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
			Albert of Padua		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
			Michael Cesenas		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
			Gregory Palamas		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	
			Andronicus		The Disputes between the Realists and Nominalists revived.	

Sov. r. ign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
Edward II 1327 Edward III 1377 Richard II 1399 Henry IV			Peter of Duisbourg Ludolf Saxon Cardinal Cajetan James of Viterbo Cardinal Balde George of Rimini Pope Benedict XII Gui of Perpignan Nicholas Cabasilas, Archbishop of Thessalonica Richard, Bishop of Ardmagh Demetrius Cydonius Petrarch Peter Berchorius John Cyparissotes Nicholas Oresme Philip Ribot Nilus Rhodius Marfilius Pat. Maximus Plan. Petrarch John Taulerus Greg. Palamas Nic. Eymericus John Rußbroch Manuel Caleca Catherine of Siena St. Bridget Gerhard of Zutphen Pierre Ailli Francis Zabarella Marfilius of Padua, who wrote against the Papal Jurisdiction. Philippe de Mazieres Jordan of Quedlinburg Barth. Albici of Pisa, author of the famous book of the Conformities of St. Francis with J. Christ. Fabri, Bishop of Chartres Michael Angrianus Raymond Jordan Jac. de Theramo Manuel Chrysoloras Cardinal Francis Zabarella, with many others, too		church, and placed at its head two rival popes. John Wickliff opposes the Monks, whose licentiousness and ignorance were scandalous, and recommends the study of the Holy Scriptures. A warm contest arises among the Franciscans about the poverty of Christ and his Apostles. Another between the Scotists and Thomists about the doctrines of their respective chiefs. Pope Clement V orders the Jubilee, which Boniface had appointed to be held every hundredth year, to be celebrated twice in that space of time. The Knights Templars are seized and imprisoned; the greatest part of them put to death, and their Order suppressed. The rise of the Roman empire, in 1303. The Golden Bull, containing rules for the election of an Emperor, and a precise account of the dignity and privileges of the electors, is issued out by Charles IV. Pope Clement VI adds the county of Avignon to the Papal territories. The Emperor Henry VII dies, and is supposed, by some authors, to have been poisoned by a consecrated wafer, which he received, at the sacrament, from the hands of Bernard Politian, a Dominican monk. This account is denied by authors of good credit. The matter, however, is still undecided.	Marfilius of Padua, a famous Lawyer John André, an eminent Jurist. Leontius Pylato, one of the restorers of learning Gentilis de Foligno Ismael Abulfeda, an Arabian Prince Peter of Ferrara Arnold of Villeneuve William Griesant, an English Mathematician Homodei of Milan Albergotti of Arezzo Philip of Leyden Baldus de Ubaldis Froissard, a French Historian.
<i>Kings of Scotland.</i> John Baliol 1306 Robert Bruce 1329 David II 1370 Robert II 1390 Robert III						
<i>Kings of Sweden.</i> Birger 1326 Magnus 1363 Albert, defeated by Margaret queen of Denmark in 1387, dies in the year 1396. Margaret						
<i>Kings of Denmark.</i> Eric VIII 1321 Christopher II 1333 Waldemar III 1375 Olaus 1387 Margaret						
<i>Kings of Poland.</i> Winceslaus 1305 Uladislaus re-ascends the throne, and dies in 1333 Casimir III 1370 the last of the Piasts. Lewis, king of Hungary 1381						
<i>Interregnum.</i> Uladislaus Jagellon, duke of Lithuania						
<i>Kings of Portugal.</i> Denis 1325 Alphonso IV 1357 Pedro the Justiciary 1367 Ferdinand 1383						
<i>Interregnum.</i> John I						
<i>Ottoman Emperors.</i> The ancient history of the Turks						

Sovereign Princes	Popes or Bishops of Rome	Archbishops of Canterbury	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
extends from the beginning of the Seventh to the commencement of the Fourteenth century. The modern commences about the beginning of the Fourteenth century.			numerous to mention.		Gun-powder is invented by Schwartz, a monk. The Mariner's compass is invented by John Goia, or, as others alledge, by Flavio.	
Othman 1327 Or Kkan 1359 Amurat or Morad 1389 Bajazet					The city of Rhodes is taken from the Saracens, in the year 1310, by the Knights Hospitallers, or, as they are now called, Knights of Malta. Tamerlane extends his conquests in the East.	
					The Bible is translated into French by the order of Charles V. The festival of the Holy lance and nails that pierced Jesus Christ instituted by Clement V. — Such was this pontif's arrogance, that once, while he was dining, he ordered Dandalus, the Venetian ambassador, to be chained under the table like a dog.	
					The beginning of the Swiss Cantons.	
					The Emperors, Lewis of Bavaria, Philip the Fair, king of France, Edward III, king of England, who, opposed the tyranny of the popes, may be looked upon as witnesses to the truth and preparers of the Reformation. To these we may add, Durand, Gerson, Olivus, who called the pope Antichrist, and Wickliff, who rejected Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Adoration of the Host, Purgatory, Meritorious Satisfactions by Penance, Auricular Confession, the Celibacy of the Clergy, Papal Excommunications, the	

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
					Worship of Images, the Virgin and Relicks. The Order of the Garter is instituted in England by Edward III.	

CENTURY XV.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
<i>Emperors of the East.</i> A. D. Manuel II 1425 John VI, Palæologus 1448 Constantine Palæologus, so far down as the year 1453, when Constantinople was taken by Mahomet II	Boniface IX 1404 Innocent VII 1406 Gregory XII deposed 1409 Alexander V 1410 John XXII deposed 1417 Martin V 1431 Eugenius IV 1447 <i>A schism — The council of Basil depose Eugenius, and elect Amadeus, first Duke of Savoy, who assumes the title of Felix V.</i> Eugenius however triumphs in the issue. Nicholas V 1455 Callistus III 1458 Pius II 1464 Paul II 1471 Sixtus IV 1484 Innocent VIII 1492 Alexander VI	Tho. Arundel 1413 H. Chicheley 1443 John Stafford 1452 John Kemp 1453 Tho. Bourchier 1486 J. Morton 1500	John Huus Jerome of Prague Paulus Anglicus John Gerson Herman de Petra Theod. de Niem, Archbp. of Cambray Tho. Valdensis Pope Alexander V John Capreolus Pet. de Anchirano Nicholas de Clemengis Theod. Urias Alphonf. Toftat John Patriarch of Antioch Mark of Ephesus Cardinal Bessarion G. Scholarius G. Gemistius John de Turrecremata George of Trapezonde John Capistran Laurentius Valla John of Segovia Franc. de la Place Reginald, Bishop of St. Asaph Antonin, Archb. of Florence Nicholas de Cusa, Bishop of Brixen and Cardinal Thomas a Kempis Anton. de Rose-lis	The Waldenses The Wicklites The White Brethren The Men of Understanding, who were headed by Ægidius Cantar, and William of Hildernissen. Picard, an Adamite. The following deserve rather the denomination of Reformers than Heretics, viz. John Huus Jerome of Prague. Branches of the Hussites, The Calixtines — Orebites — Orphans — Taborites Bohem. Brethren. As also John Petit John Wesselus Peter Osma Matth. Grabon.	The Moors and Jews are converted in Spain by force. In the year 1492, Christopher Columbus opens a passage into America, by the discovery of the islands of Hispaniola, Cuba, and Jamaica. Constantinople taken by the Turks in the year 1453. Letters flourish in Italy, under the protection of the House Medici and the Neapolitan monarchs of the House of Arragon. The calamities of the Greeks, under the Turkish government, conduce to the advancement of learning among the Latins. The council of Constance is assembled by the Emperor Sigismund in the year 1414. John Huus and Jerome of Prague are committed to the flames by a decree of that council. The council of Basil is opened in the year 1431, and in it the reformation of the church is attempted in vain. Horrible enormities committed by the	Laurentius Valla, the great restorer of Latin elocution Leonard Aretin Gasparini William Lynwood Alexan. Charrier Gob. Persona Fr. Frezzi Christine of Pisa Paul de Castro Poggio of Florence John Fortescue, High Chancellor of England Theod. Gaza Bart. Facio Dlugoffus, a Polish Histor. R. Sanc. de Arevalo Laon. Calcondilas J. Savonarola Marcilius Ficinus John Picus de Mirandula Marc. Coc. Sabellus Forestus Ant. Bonfinius Jovian. Pontanus
<i>Emperors of the West.</i> Robert 1410 Jodocus not acknowledged Sigismund 1437 Albert II of Aust 1439 Frederick III 1493 Maximilian I						
<i>Kings of Spain, i. e. of Leon and Castile.</i> Henry III 1406 John II 1454 Henry IV 1474 Ferdinand, in right of Isabella						
<i>Kings of France.</i> Charles VI 1422 Charles VII 1461 Lewis XI 1483 Charles VIII 1498 Lewis XII						

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
<i>Kings of England.</i>			Rickel		popes of this century, and more especially by Alexander VI.	Leonard Justinian
Henry IV 1413			Ducas		The council of Constance remove the Sacramental Cup from the laity, and declare it lawful to violate the most solemn promises and engagements when made to heretics.	G. Gemistus
Henry V 1422			Bened. de Accolis		The war of the Hussites in Bohemia.	J. Alvarot
Henry VI de-throned in 1461			Guill. de Aoupe-lande		Institution of the Order of the Golden Fleece.	Guarino de Verone
Edward IV 1482			James Paradise, an English Carthusian		The Moors and Jews driven out of Spain.	J. Juv. des Urfsins
Edward V 1483			Aeneas Sylvius Piccolom, Pope Pins II		The massacre of Varnes, in the year 1444.	Maff. Vegio
Richard III 1485			Leon. Justinian		The Order of Minimes instituted by Francis de Pauls.	Flavio Biondo
Henry VII			John Gobelin		Exploits of the Maid of Orleans.	J. Argyropuleus
<i>Kings of Scotland.</i>			Alphonso de Spina		The art of printing is invented by Coster at Harlem, as some authors alledge; or by Faustus and Guttemberg of Mentz, according to others.	Dr. Thomas Lynacre
Robert III 1406			Greg. de Heymbourg		The Universities of Leipsick, Louvain, Frisbourg, Restock, Basle, Tubingen, Wurtzburg, Turin, Ingolstadt, St. Andrew's in Scotland, Poitiers, Glasgow, Griepswalde in Pomerania, Pisa, Bourdeaux, Triers, Toledo, Upsal, Mentz, Copenhagen, founded in this century.	The Strozzi
James I 1437			Theod. Lelio		The first book printed, which was the Vulgate Bible in two volumes.	Bon. Monbrius
James II 1460			Henry of Cocum		The second book, printed in the year 1466, was Cicero's De officiis.	P. Callim. Esperiente
James III 1488			J. Ant. Campanus		The famous Pragmatic sanction established in France.	Jul. Pompon. Latus
James IV			Alex. de Imola		The University of Caen in Normandy, in	Angel. Politian
<i>Kings of Sweden and Denmark.</i>			Henry Harphius			Fulgosi
Margaret 1412			J. Perez			A. Urceus Cordus
Eric IX deposed in 1438			P. de Natalibus			Mich. Marullus
Christopher III 1448			B. Platina			Oliver de la Marche
Charles Canutson 1471			P. Niger			Caiado
<i>An Interregnum until the year 1483.</i>			John de Wessalia			Abarbanel
John			Hermol. Barbarus			Calepin
<i>Kings of Poland.</i>			Mich. of Milan			Bebel
Uladislaus Jag. 1434			Steph. Brulefer			Martial de Paris
Uladislaus, king of Hungary 1444			Cardinal Andr. du St. Sixte			Phil. de Comines
<i>An Interregnum of three years.</i>			Savanarola			Al. Achillini
Casimir IV 1492			Marcilius Ficinus			Scipio Carceromaco
John Albert			John Tritheme			John Baptiste Porta
<i>Kings of Portugal.</i>			John Pic. of Mirandula			Aldus Manutius
John I 1433			Ant. de Lebrixa			Cherefeddin
Edward 1438			Bouffard			Ali, a Persian Historian
Alphonso V 1481			J. Reuchlin, otherwise called Capnio			Arabschah, an Arabian Hist.
John II 1495			Jovianus Pontanus			J. Whitehamsted
Emmanuel the Great			Nich. Simonis			Ulugbeg, a Tartar Prince
<i>Otoman Emperors.</i>			Claude de Seyssel			J. Bracelli
Bajazet taken prisoner by Tamerlane in 1402			Simeon of Thessalonica			Palmieri
Solyman 1410			Gobelinus Persona			Villon, otherwise Corbueil
Moufa 1413			Henry of Hestia			Vuller, sur-named Regiomontanus
Mahomet I 1421			George Phranza			
Amurat II 1451			Vincent Ferrieres			
Mahomet II, who takes Constanti-			Julianus Cæsarius			
			Nich. Tudeschus or Panormus			

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bishops — of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics, real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Au- thors.
nople in 1453 and dies in 1481 Bajazet II. Czars or Emperors of Russia. There reigns in the Chronology of these Princes an uncommon degree of confusion, suita- ble to the barba- rism of that na- tion. In the year 1732, they began to publish at Pe- tersburg a series of their Sovereigns, beginning with Duke Ruricke, who is supposed to have reigned in the ninth century. From that time downwards, all is darkness and per- plexity, until we come to the reign of John Basilo- witz I, who, in the fifteenth cen- tury, shook off the yoke of the Tar- tars, and assumed, first, the title of Czar, after hav- ing conquered the kingdom of Casan. We therefore be- gin with this Prince, and shall follow the Chrono- logy observed by the authors of the Modern Universal History, in their History of Russia. The Reader may, however, con- sult the Tablettes Chronologic. de l'Histoire Uni- verselle of LENG- LET, who places this Prince in the sixteenth century. John Basilowitz			Raymond Sabund Catherine of Bo- logn Gregorius Melif- sen Marcus Eugenius Laurent. Justinian Sylvester Syropul Ambrose, General of the Camaldules George Codinus Onuphr. Panvi- nius Gabriel Biel John Nauclerus John Nieder		founded by the Eng- lish in the year 1437. The Portuguese sail, for the first time, to the East-Indies, under Vasquez de Gama. Maximilian divides the empire into six circles.	Calentius, a Latin Poet Dom. Calde- rini Barth. Fontius Enguerr. de Monstrelet Andronicus of Theffalonica George of Ta- pesonde Fr. Philelphi Alex. Imola J. Ant. Cam- pani Nich. Perotti Th. Littleton Ant. of Paler- mo Constant. Laf- caris A. Barbatius Christ. Persona Bern. Justiniani Dieb. Schilling Ralph Agri- cola J. Andrea Ermol. Bar- baro Alex. ab Alex- andro G. Merula M.M. Boiardo A. Mancinelli Rob. Gaguin Bern. Corio Gabr. Altilius Gul. Caoursin J. Nanni Al. Ranuccini P. Crinitus Molines Cettes John Murl- lius Mark Musurus Jafon Mainus Pandolf. Col- lenucio R. Langius John Collet Pietro Cosimo Abraham Za- chut

CENTURY XVI.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bps. of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
<i>Emperors.</i>	Alexander VI 1503	Henry Dean 1502	John Sleidan	Schwenckfeldt	The Reformation is introduced into Germany by Luther, in the year 1517; into France by Calvin, about 1529; into Switzerland by Zuingli, in 1519.	<i>British Authors.</i>
Maximilian I 1519	Pius III 1503	W. Warham 1532	William Budæus	Andr. Osiander		Thomas Linacre
Charles V, abdicates the Empire in 1556	Julius II 1513	Tho. Cranmer 1555	Desiderius Erasmus	Stancarus	Henry VIII of England throws off the papal yoke, and becomes supreme head of the church.	S. Purchas
Ferdinand 1564	Leo X 1521	Reginald Pole 1558	Martin Luther	Adiaphorists		Thomas Elliot
Maximilian II 1576	Adrian VI 1523	Matth. Parker 1575	Ph. Melancthon	Interimists	Edward VI encourages the Reformation in England, and invites Martin Luther and other eminent divines over to finish that glorious work.	Hest. Boetius
Rodolphus	Clement VII 1534	Edm. Grindall 1583	John Brentius	Agricola of Isleben, the chief of the Antinomians		J. Leland, the Antiquary
<i>Kings of Spain.</i>	Paul III 1549	John Whitgift	Martin Bucer	George Major	The reign of Queen Mary restores popery, and exhibits a scene of barbarity and persecution that shocks nature.	Ed. Wotton
Ferdinand V, surnamed the Catholic, king of Arragon, in consequence of his marriage with Isabella, becomes king of Castile; and the kingdoms of Arragon and Castile remain united.	Julius III 1555		Ulric Zuingli	N. Amstdorff		J. Christopherson
Ferdinand and Isabella dispossessed 1504	Marcellus II 1555		Peter Galatin	Synergists	The name of Protestants given to the Reformed at the diet of Spire, in 1529.	Ed. Wotton
Philip I of Austria 1506	Paul IV 1559		Fr. Ximenes	M. Flacius		J. Christopherson
Jane 1516	Pius IV 1566		Thomas More	Crypto-Calvinists	The league of Smalcald is formed in 1530.	Cuth. Tonstal
Charles I or V 1558	Pius V 1572		John Whitgift, Archb. of Canterbury	Anabaptists		R. Ascham
Philip II 1598	Gregory XIII 1585		John Fisher	Mennonites	The Reformation introduced into Scotland by John Knox, about the year 1560; and	J. Kaye
Philip III	Sixtus V 1590		John Ecolampadius	Theoph. Racellus		Thomas Smith
N. B. Philip II seizes upon Portugal, which remains in the possession of the Kings of Spain, until the year 1640.	Urban VII 1590		And. Carolstadt	Postellus	Into Ireland by George Brown, about the same time;	George Buchanan
	Gregory XIV 1591		John Tilius	David Georgius		Alex. Arbuthnot
	Innocent IX 1592		James Faber	Franc. Pucius	Into the United Provinces, about the year 1566.	Sir Phil. Sidney
	Clement VIII		Matthew Flacius	Defid. Erasmus		John Fox
			John Calvin	Agrippa	Gustavus Ericson introduces the Reformation into Sweden, by the ministry of Olaus Petri, in 1530.	Fr. Walsingham
			Martin Chemnitz	Castander and Wicelius		Ed. Grant
			James Andreas	Conr. Vorstius	It was received in Denmark, in 1521.	Ed. Anderson
			David Chytræus	Sam. Huberus		John Dee
			William Farel	Mich. Servetus	The Gospel is propagated by the papal missionaries in India, Japan, and China.	Thomas Craig
			Theodore Beza	Valent. Gentilis		G. Creighton
			Faustus Socinus	Lælius Socinus		Ed. Breewood
			Ben. Arias Montanus	Faustus Socinus		<i>French Authors.</i>
			And. Osiander	Quintin, the chief of the Libertines		William Budé
			Ægid. Hunnius			Clement Marot
			Melchior Canus			Fr. Rabelais
			Polyc. Lyserus			Ja. Dubois (Sylvius)
			George Wicellus			Pierre Gilles
			George Cassander			Or. Finée
			Cardinal Bellarmine			Robert Stephens
			Stella			P. Belon
			Crantzius			William Morel
			Thomas Illyricus			Adr. Turnebus
			Jacob Ben Chaim, who gave an edition of the Hebrew Bible			Ch. Du Moulin
			Sanderus			Gilb. Cousin
			Isid. Clarius			Mich. de l'Hopital
			John Major			L. Le Roy (Regius)
			Andrew Vega			Hub. Languet, author of the Vindicie contra Tyrannos
			Franc. Vatable			Laur. Joubert
			Cardinal Sadolet			James Felenier
			Cardinal Cortesius			Fr. Belleforest
			John Cochlaeus			M. A. Fr. Muret
			Alphonf. Zamora			P. Ronfard
						J. Dorat
						James Cujas

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bps of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
<i>Kings of England.</i> Henry VII 1509 Henry VIII 1547 Edward VI 1553 Mary 1558 Elizabeth			Vivaldus J. Almain Spagnoli Aug. Dathus Pope Adrian VI Petro de Monte Pope Leo X Alb. Pighius Henry VIII, king of England Lewis Vives S. Pagninus Leon de Castro Matth. Ugonius Cardinal Cajetan James Hoogstra- at Ambr. Catharini John Faber Ortuin Gratus John Eckius Leander Alberti Nic. Serrarius Pet. Canisius Cæsar Baronius Fran. Ribera Pierre Pithou Mich. Baius W. Alan, Eng- lish Cardinal Mercator Nic. Harpsfield Leunclavius Molina Salmeron Maldonat J. Natalis J. P. Maffei Cardinal Hofius Janfenius John Tillet James Naclantus De Vargas Cardinal Seripand And. Mafius Pope Paul IV Widmanstadt Gassander Stapleton Mercerus F. Xavier Ign. Loyola Bishop Gardiner Jer. Oleaster, with many others too numerous to mention. N. B. It is re- markable that, a- mong the Eccle- siastical Writers		The Order of the Jesuits is founded by Ignatius Loyola, in the year 1540. The famous coun- cil of Trent is assem- bled. The Pragmatic Sanction is abrogated by Leo X, and the Concordate substituted into its place. Pope Julius III be- stows the Cardinal's hat upon the keeper of his monkeys. The Inquisition is established at Rome by Paul IV. The war of the Peasants. The Universities of Wittemberg, Francfort on Oder, Alcala, Sa- ragossa, Marburg, Se- ville, Compostella, O- viedo, Grenade, Frane- ker, Strasbourg, Par- ma, Macerata, Tor- tofa, Coimbre, Conigf- berg, Leyden, Florence, Reims, Dillingen, Mex- ico, St. Domingo, Tar- ragona, Helmstadt, Al- torf, Paderborn, Sigen, founded in this cen- tury. The treaty of Pas- sau, in 1552. The Paris massacre of the Protestants on St. Bartholomew's day. The republic of the United Provinces formed by the union of Utrecht. The edict of Nantes granted to the Pro- testants by Henry IV of France.	Fr. Hotman James Amyot Mich. de Mon- tagne Mich. de Castel- nau P. Pithou J. Bodin Nic. Vignier Bl. de Vigenere Henry Stephens J. de Serres (Ser- ranus) Cl. Fauchet J. Passerat J. J. Boissard P. Daniel, d'Or- leans Francis Viète Cardinal d'Ossat Rob. Constantin P. Morin Jof. Just. Scaliger Nic. Rapin J. Papire-Maffon P. B. Brantome St. Pasquier Italian Authors. Americ. Vespu- tius J. Jocondi of Ve- rona, who dis- covered the Let- ters of Pliny Leonici, the translator of Ga- len Pomponace M. A. Casanova P. Gravina Sannazarius Machiavel Vida J. A. Lascaris Alcyonius, trans- lator of Aristotle Ariosto Burn. Maffei Fr. Guiccardini Cardinal Bembo Cardinal Sadolet And. Alciat M. A. Flaminio d'Imola Lilius Giraldus J. Fracastor Polydor Vergil M. A. Majoragio P. Aretin J. de la Casa
<i>Kings of Scotland.</i> James IV 1513 James V 1542 Mary beheaded in 1587 James VI						
<i>Kings of Sweden and Denmark.</i> John 1513 Christiern II de- posed in 1522 Gustavus Ericson 1560 N. B. Sweden is separated from Denmark un- der this Prince. Eric deposed in 1568 John III 1592 Sigismund king of Poland, deposed in 1599 Charles IX						
<i>Kings of Den- mark.</i> Christiern II de- posed in 1522 Frederick I 1533 Christiern III 1559 Frederick II 1588 Christiern IV						
<i>Kings of Poland.</i> John Albert 1501 Alexander 1506 Sigismund I 1548 Sigismund II 1572 Henry of Anjou, until the year 1574 Stephen Batori 1587 Sigismund king of Sweden						
<i>Kings of Portugal.</i> Emmanuel the Great 1521 John III 1557						

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bps. of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
Sebastian 1578 Henry Card. 1580 <i>Portugal is reduced under the dominion of Spain by Philip II.</i> Ottoman Emperors. Bajazet II 1512 Selim I 1520 Solyman II 1566 Selim II 1574 Amurat III 1595 Mahomet III Czars of Muscovy. John Basilowitz 1505 Basilus Swano- witz, who receives from Maximilian I the title of Emperor 1533 John Basilowitz II 1584 Theodore Iwanowitz 1597 Boris Gadenow Stattholders of the United Provinces. William I, the glorious founder of their Liberty 1584 Maurice			of this century, there are above 55 who employed their labours in the exposition and illustration of the Holy Scriptures; and this happy circumstance contributed, no doubt, to prepare the minds of many for the REFORMATION, and thus rendered its progress more rapid.			L. Alamanni N. Tartaglia Palingenius Jul. Cæs. Scaliger Zanchius Gab. Faerno Gab. Fallopius J. Acronius Louis Cornaro Robortello Palearius Onuph. Panvini Argentieri J. Bar. de Vignole Paul Manutius Jerome Cardan A. Palladio C. Sigonius P. Victorius Oct. Ferrari James Zabarella L. Guiccardini A. de Costanzo Torq. Tasso Fr. Patrizi (Patritius) Ant. Riccoboni G. Panciroli And. Cefalpin Natalis Comes Aldovrandi Gratiani B. Guarini Swift Authors. Aur. Ph. Paracelsus Theod. Bibliander Theod. Zwinger Isaac Casaubon German and Dutch Authors. J. Reuchlin P. Mosellan M. Aurogallus, who assisted Luther in the translation of the Bible H. C. Agrippa D. Erasmus of Rotterdam Luscinius Simon Grynaeus Adr. Barland of Zealand Nic. Copernicus, a Prussian

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bps. of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events— Religious Rites—	Profane Authors.
						J. Secundus of the Hague J. Olaus Magnus Peutingier Paul Fagius Sabastian Munster G. Agricola John Sleidan Gasp. Bruschius P. Lotichius Conrad Gefner G. Fabricius A. Masius Joach. Camera- rius Viglius of Zuic- hem Hubert Goltzius John Sturmius J. Sambuc A. G. Busbeq J. Leunclavius G. Mercator Læv. Torrentius Raphelingius Ortelius Tycho-Braché, a Dane Heurnius of U- trecht Nich. Craigius of Copenhagen Justus Lipsius Paul Merula of Leyden A. Gorlaeus Schönæus Em. Van Meteren Dom. Baudius

CENTURY XVII.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bps. of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events— Religious Rites—	Profane Authors.
Emperors. A. D Rodolphus II 1612 Matthias 1619 Ferdinand II 1637 Leopold I Kings of Spain. Philip III 1621	Clement VIII 1605 Leo XI 1605 Paul V 1621 Gregory XV 1623 Urban VIII 1644 Innocent X 1655	Dr. J. Whit- gift 1603 Dr. R. Ban- croft 1610 Dr. George Abbot 1633 Dr. W. Laud 1644 Dr. W. Jux- on 1663	Protestant Wri- ters. Archb. Abbot John Lightfoot Matthew Pool Bishop Pearson Bishop Fell Gataker Bishop Ward Owen Edward Pocock	The doctrine of the Jesuits, concerning phi- losophical sin condemned by Pope Alexan- der VIII, in 1690 The Probabi- lists (so the Jesuits were	The congregation De propaganda, &c. founded at Rome, in 1622, by Pope Gregory XV. Christianity is pro- pagated in the king- doms of Siam, Tong- king, and Kochinchina, by the Jesuit-Mission- aries.	No century has been so fertile in authors as this before us. Their number amounts to above 850. We shall confine our- selves to those who were most eminent in each country.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bps. of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
Philip IV 1665 (Portugal throws off the Spanish yoke, and recovers its independency, in the year 1640)	Alexander VII 1667	Dr. Gil, Sheldon 1677	Bishop Bull Grew	called from their odious doctrine of Probability)	The thirty years war breaks out, and is concluded by the peace of Westphalia.	In Great Britain and Ireland.
Charles II 1700	Clement IX 1669	Dr. W. Sancroft 1693	Bishop Burnet Jo. Forbes	condemned by the Sorbonne.	The Moors are driven out of Spain.	John Harrington James Harrington J. Pitt
	Clement X 1676	Dr. John Tillotson 1694	J. Baxter	The Franciscans are judged Heretics, on account of their doctrine concerning the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary.	The Protestants are persecuted in France.	R. Stanihurst Sir Henry Saville
	Innocent XI 1689	Dr. Thomas Tennison	John Tillotson, Archbp. of Canterbury		The Gunpowder-Treason discovered in England.	Thomas Hariot, the inventor of Algebra
Kings of France.	Alexander VIII 1691		Dr. Sherlock Archbp. Wake		A rupture between Pope Paul V and the Venetians.	W. Camden
Henry IV 1610	Innocent XII 1700		Chillingworth		The Royal Society is founded in the year 1662.	Nich. Fuller
Lewis XIII 1643			Henry Hammond		A Jubilee is celebrated by Pope Clement VIII, in the year 1600.	Ben. Johnson
Lewis XIV			Thomas Hyde		In 1605, Maurice, Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, introduces the Reformed religion into Marburg.	Shakespear
Kings of England.			William Cave		Paul V excommunicates the Venetians, whose cause is defended by Fra-Paulo.	Henry Wootton
Elizabeth 1603			Brian Walton		In the year 1606, Rudolph II allows the Hungarians the free exercise of the Protestant religion, that had been formerly granted by Ferdinand I, and abolished by his successors.	Thomas Lydiat
James I, VI th of Scotland 1625			Drufius		The Silesians, Moravians, and Bohemians, are allowed, by Rudolph II, the free exercise of their religion, in the year 1609.	Joseph Hall, called the English Seneca
Charles I, beheaded in the year 1649			Hospinian		The Protestants form a confederacy at Heilbron, in the year 1610; and the Roman Catholics form a league at Wurtzburg in opposition to it.	Lord Herbert of Cherburch
Cromwel usurps the government under the title of Lord Protector, and dies in 1658			Trigland		The Bohemians chuse Frederick V, Elector Palatine, for	Thomas Gataker
Charles II 1684			Ittigius			W. Habington
James II, abandons his kingdoms in the year 1688 and dies in 1701			Fr. Spanheim			Archbp. Usher
William III and Mary 1694			R. Cudworth			W. Harvey, who first discovered the circulation of the blood
			Ed. Stillingfleet			Sir Ken. Digby
			H. Prideaux			Sir James Ware
			J. Locke			John Milton
			W. Lloyd, Bishop of Worcester			Abr. Cowley
			J. Milton			J. Ogilby
			St. Nye			Lord Chanc. Clarendon
			Claude Daillé			Matthew Hales
			Amyraut			Fr. Gliffon
			Basnage, Samuel and James			Th. Stanley
			Jurieu			Joseph Glanvil
			Benoit			Samuel Butler
			Turretin			Algernoon Sidney
			Elias Saurin			John Collins, Mathematician
			Morus			Robert Morison
			Le Cene			William Dugdale
			Mester Zat			Ralph Cudworth
			Le Blanc			J. Rushworth
			Arminius			Robert Boyle
			Grotius			John Locke
			Episcopius			W. Molyneux
			Curcellæus			Sir W. Temple
			Limborch			Sir Paul Ricaut
			Heidan			H. Hody
			Cocceius			Bishop Beverege
			Voetius			Sir Samuel Garth
			Gomar			Thomas Gale
			Lud. Capell			John Philips
			S. Bochart			Bishop Spratt
			Gerhardus Hoe			Thomas Dempster
			Calixtus, G. and Fred.			John Fletcher
			Hulseman			
			Heilbronner			
			Haffenreffer			
			Thummius			

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bps. of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
<i>Kings of Denmark.</i> Christiern IV 1648 Frederick III 1670 Christiern V 1699 Frederick IV			The Ofianders — Musæus — Hutter Hunnius, Guy and Nich. The Mentzers — Olearius's Fred. Baldwin Alb. Grawer The Carpozovius's Tarnovius, J. and Paul John Affelman Eilhart Luber The Lysers Mich. Walter Joach. Hildebrand J. Val. Andreas Solom. Glaffius Ab. Calovius Theod. Hackspan J. Hulfeman Jacob Weller J. Conr. Danha-ver J. G. Dorfcæus John Arndt Mart. Geyer John Ad. Schertzer	men, Valentine Weigelius, Nic-Drabicius, Seidel, Stifeli- us, and the Roscrufians.	their king, in order to maintain them in the free exercise of the Protestant religion — but Frederick is conquered, and they are forced to embrace popery. In 1625, the princes of Lower Saxony enter into a league with Christian IV of Denmark, which concludes by the peace of Lubec. Ferdinand II publishes, in 1629, an edict, ordering the Protestants to surrender and restore all the ecclesiastical domains and possessions of which they were become masters after the pacification of Passau. — This edict is disobeyed. Gustavus Adolphus enters into Germany. The peace of Munster and Osnabrug concluded, by which the three Religions are tolerated in the empire. The synod of Dort assembled in the year 1618, and sits from the 1st of November, till the 26th of April. Henry IV of France is assassinated by Ravillac. This event exposes the Protestants to new persecutions. The edict of Nantes is perfidiously revoked by Lewis XIV, and the Protestants treated with the utmost barbarity. A contest between Lewis XIV and Pope Innocent XI, concerning the collation of benefices and the privileges and pretensions of the crown during their vacancy. The French clergy, in a general assembly	Ph. Massinger Ed. Gunther Franc. Bacon, Lord Verulam Thomas Ridley John Speed John Donne Fr. Goodwin, the <i>Annalist</i> Edward Coke Thom. Randolph Tho. Farnaby John Napier, inventor of Logarithms G. Keating John Greaves Edward Simson John Selden William Burton Richard Zouch W. Oughtred B. Walton P. Heylin James Howel Sir John Denham Sir John Marsham Bishop Wilkins James Gregory Thomas Willis Bulst. Whitelock John Price Isaac Barrow Thomas Hobbes Thomas Brown Thomas Marshall Edmond Castell Thomas Ottway Ed. Waller Dr. Sydenham Ant. Wood Ed. Bernard, Professor of Astron. Bishop Stillingfleet William Somner John Dryden John Wallis John Ray D. Gregory M. Lister Henry Dodwell N. Grew Sir H. Spelman
<i>Kings of Poland.</i> Sigismund III 1632 Uladislaus Sig. 1648 John Casimir 1669 Michael I 1674 John Sobieski 1697 Frederick Augustus, elector of Saxony			Theod. Hackspan J. Hulfeman Jacob Weller J. Conr. Danha-ver J. G. Dorfcæus John Arndt Mart. Geyer John Ad. Schertzer Balthasar and John Meifner Aug. Pfeiffer Muller, H. and J. Just. Chr. Schomer Sebast. Schmidt Christ. Horsholt Ph. Jac. Spener G. Th. Mayer Frid. Bechman From Gerhard to Frid. Bechman inclusively all Lutherans.			
<i>Kings of Portugal.</i> John, Duke of Bragança, chosen king in 1640 dies in 1656 Alphonso, VI de-throned in 1667 Pedro II						
<i>Ottoman Emperors.</i> Mahomet III 1604 Achmet I 1617 Mustapha 1617 Osman 1622 Mustapha restored 1623 Amurat IV 1640 Ibrahim 1655 Mahomet IV 1687 Solyman III 1691 Achmet II 1695 Mustapha II			<i>Roman Catholic Authors.</i> Baronius Bellarmin Serrarius Fevardentius Possevin Gretser Combesis Nat. Alexander Becan Sirmond Petau Poussines Cellot Caussin			
<i>Czars of Muscovy.</i> Boris Gade 1605 Theodore Boril-fowitz 1605 The false Demetrius 1606 Basilius Zuski 1610 II Demetrius 1610 III Demetrius 1610						
						<i>French Authors.</i> J. Aug. De Thou Pineau Gillot Mornac P. Matthieu Du Vair

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bps. of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
Uladisslaus of Poland 1613 IV Demetrius 1613 Michael Theodorowitz 1645 Alexis Michaelowitz 1676 Theodore Alexowitz 1682 Ivan or John Peter I } 1688 Alexio-witz } Stadtholders of the United Provinces. Maurice 1625 Frederick Henry 1647 William II 1650 The dignity of Stadtholder remains vacant during the space of 22 year.			Morin Renaud Fra-Paolo Pallavicini Labbé Maimbourg Thomassin Sfondrat Aguirre Henry Noris D'Achery Mabillon Hardouin Simon Ruinart Montfaucon Galloni Schacchi Cornelius a Lapide Bonfrere Menard Segenot Bernard Lamy Bollandus Henschen Papebroch Perron Estius Launoy Tillemont Godeau Albaspinæus Richlieu Holstenius Baluzius Bona Huet Bossuet Fenelon Thiers Du Pin Leo Allatius Zaccagni Cotelier Filefac Visconti Molina Arriaga Rigault Richer Pererius Mariana Fr. Pithou Fr. de Sales M. de Calasio Lessius Pineda C. Jansenius Bentivoglio		at St. Germain, declare the pope's pretensions to temporalities null and void; place the authority of a general council above that of the pope; and maintain, that the decisions of the pope are not infallible, unless when attended with the consent of the church. The Irish massacre in 1641, in which above 40,000, some say 150,000, Protestants are murdered. Charles I, king of England, beheaded in the year 1649. A sort of commonwealth introduced by Cromwell, under which episcopacy suffers, and the Presbyterians, or rather the Independents, flourish. Charles II restored, and with him episcopacy re-established. The glorious Revolution renders memorable the year 1688. The Protestants are oppressed and persecuted in many places. Several false Messiahs discovered, and particularly Sabbati Levi, who, to avoid death, embraces Mahometanism. The Universities of Lunden in Sweden, Gießen, Pampelune, Saltzbourg, Derpt in Livonia, Utrecht, Abo, Duisburg, Kiel in Holstein, Inspruck, Bologna, Hall.—The Academies of inscriptions, &c. of Sciences, founded at Paris.	Fr. Pithou J. Barclai Savaron Pr. Jeannin Godefroi Bergier Le Mercier Boulanger Goulart Malherbe Marillac N and C. Le Pois J. B. Le Meneftrier J. Bap. Duval P. Haye du Chastelet R. Des Cartes N. Fab. de Peiresc Henr. Duc de Rohan De Meziriac J. Bourdelot J. Guthieres And. du Chesne Louis Savot Val. Conrart Cardinal Richlieu Rochemaillet Philib. Monet Nic. Bourbon Aug. Galland J. F. Niceron Edm. Merille Sam. Petit M. Merfenne Voiture De Vaugelas Ch. Justel Did. Herault J. Baudoin P. du Puy G. and Louis de St. Marthe Denis Petau G. Fournier Cl. Saumaïse G. Naudé N. Rigault De Balzac G. B. de Grammont Sarasin D. Blondel P. Gaffendi J. Bignon C. H. Fabrot L. Ch. Le Fevre N. Perrot. d'Ab-lancourt N. Sanfon

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bps. of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
			Sponde Bzovius H. de Valois P. de Marca Arnaud d'Andilly Du Cange Pascal Du Boulay A. Arnaud Vavasseur Neercassel J. Le Maitre de Sacy Pagi Lami Pezron Gerberon Quesnel <i>These are the most noted writ- ters of the Romish church during this century.</i>			Briet Tan. Le Fevre Fr. La Mothe Vayer Moliere G. M. le Jay Roberval Rohault H. and Adr. de Valois F. H. d'Aubignac J. Esprit L. Moreri Duc de Roche- foucalt R. le Bossu F. E. de Mezeray P. Corneille Ed. Mariotte J. Spon G. d'Eftrades Cn. Perrault P. Bayle Vauban Tournefort Th. Corneille Boileau Ren. Rapin Jean Doujat Fr. Bernier Ch. du Fresne du Cange Cl. Perrault If. de Benferade Thevenot G. Menage De St. Real Peliffon Buffy Rabut Ch. Patin B. d'Herbelot Cl. Lancelot St. Evremont Amelot de la Houffaye Louis Cousin F. S. Regn. Des Marais A. Felibien Jean de la Bruy- ere Sim. Foucher J. Domat J. B. Santeuil C. P. Richelet P. J. d'Orleans J. Racine J. Barbeyrac Et. Morin Baudrand Segrais

<i>Sovereign Princes.</i>	<i>Popes or Bps. of Rome.</i>	<i>Archbishops of Canterbury.</i>	<i>Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.</i>	<i>Heretics real or reputed.</i>	<i>Remarkable Events—Religious Rites—</i>	<i>Profane Authors.</i>
						Chevreau Charpentier Bohours Marquis de l'Hopital Vaillant P. Silv. Regis Theod. Agrip. d'Aubigné <i>Italian Authors.</i> Prosper Alpini B. Baldi J. A. Magini A. Morosini Luc. Valeri Paul Beni Davila L. Pignoria Salvador Sanctorius Tho. Campanella Alex. Donato Mascardi Galilei Bentivolio Strozzi Leon de Modena Bonav. Cavaleri Ev. Torricelli J. V. Roffi Fam. Strada T. Galluzzi Martini Imperiali Tomaffini Virg. Malvezzi Molinetti Sert. Orfato J. B. Nani J. A. Borelli Ricci Oët. Ferrari Bartolucci M. Malpighi Bellori Viviani Bellini Bocconi Averani Cassini Magalotti <i>Spanish and Portuguese Authors.</i> Cervantes Ant. de Ledesma J. Mariana, the Historian Ant. Herrera, the Historian

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bps. of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors.
						Aldrete, the Anti- quarian Balbuena J. L. de la Cerda Lopes de Vega, the Spanish Ho- mer Nic. de Antonio Balth. Gracian Diego de Couto Jof. Taxeira Rod. Lobo Eman. Faria del Souza Ant. Perez Man. Alvares Pe- gase German, Dutch, Swiss, Swedish, &c. Authors. Pauw, Anatomy Aiguillon Emmius Gruterus Bertius Andr. Schott Martinius Snellius of Leyden James and Adrian Metius Cunæus J. Meurfius Lewis De Dieu J. B. Van Hel- mont Hugo Grotius Erycius Puteanus Gasp. Barlæus Van Hooft Const. Imperator Manassé Ben Israel B. Varenius Sanderus Vander Linden J. Golius Aitzema Hoeschellius Ch. Helvicus Melch. Adam Cluverius Hospinian Rosinus Buxtorf Kepler Goldast Horstius Sennert Erasim. Schmidt Alstedius Pareus

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bps. of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics real or reputed.	Remarkable Events— Religious Rites—	Profane Authors.
						Hoffman Scioppius G. J. Vossius Gasp. Barthius Freinshemius Schrivellius J. Gerard Hornius Etmuller Olaus Rudbeck Bartholin Isaac Pontanus Chr. Longomontanus John Rhodius Bangius Meric Casaubon Ad. Olearius J. F. Gronovius Reinier Graaf J. Swammerdam Fr. Junius A. Maria Schuurman Ath. Kircher Conringius N. Heinsius Wicquefort Noldius Kunckel H. Meibomius Ludolf J. G. Grævius Burch. de Volder Olaus Wormius J. R. Wettstein of Basel Varenius of Lunenburg Thomæus Dodonæus Otto Guerick, inventor of the Air-pump Jof. Arndius John Gasp. Suicer Isaac Vossius Olaus Borrichius D. G. Morhoff G. Sagittarius Sam. Puffendorff Ch. C. Huygens J. Tollius Eraf. Bartholinus J. Leusden of Utrecht Wagenfelius Brockhuysen Cellarius Ezech. Spanheim Gurtler of Basel

CENTURY XVIII.

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bps. of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic Writers.	Heretics or Enemies of Revelation.	Remarkable Events—Religious Rites—	Profane Authors, deceased.
<i>Emperors.</i> A. D. Leopold 1705 Joseph 1711 Charles VI 1742 <i>The last Emperor of the House of Austria.</i> Charles Albert of Bavaria 1745 Francis, Duke of Lorraine <i>Kings of Spain.</i> Philip, who abdicates the crown in 1724 Lewis 1724 Philip, re-ascends the throne in 1724 and dies in 1746 Ferdinand VI 1759 Charles III, now reigning <i>Kings of France.</i> Lewis XIV 1715 Lewis XV, now reigning <i>Kings of England.</i> William III 1702 Anne 1714 George I 1727 George II 1760 George III <i>Kings of Sweden.</i> Charles XII 1718 Ulric E-leonora } Frederick } 1751 <i>of Hesse-Cassel</i> Adolphus Frederick of Holstein, now reigning <i>Kings of Denmark.</i> Frederick IV 1730 Christiern VI 1746	Clement XI 1721 Innocent XIII 1724 Benedict XIII 1730 Clement XII 1740 Benedict XIV 1758 Clement XIII	Dr. Thomas Tennison 1715 Dr. William Wake 1736 Dr. J. Potter Dr. Thomas Herring Dr. Thomas Secker	N. B. In this list none but deceased authors are mentioned. <i>Protestant Writers.</i> Sir Isaac Newton Dr. Rich. Bentley Bishop Hare Bishop Cumberland Bishop Atterbury Dr. Sam. Clarke Bishop Chandler Bishop Berkley Bishop Butler Woolaston Dr. Mill Dr. Edwards Dr. Whitby Mr. Whiston Abernethy Dr. Bennet Archbp. Wake Bishop Smallridge Sir P. King, Lord Chancellor Archbp. Potter Derham Dr. Hicks Bishop Sherlock Bishop Conybear Witfius of Leyd. Trigland of Leyd. Vitranga of Franc. Marckius Roel Beaufobre Lenfant Bouiller Leydekker Gurtler Braunius Hulffii Piçtet Abbadie J. Al. Turnetin Werensfels Ostervald Jablonski Strimesius Holzfufius Meyer Jurieu	John Toland Matt. Tyn-dal Ant. Collins Tho. Wool-ston Ch. Blount Tho. Morgan John Chubb John Mandeville Lord Boling-broke; and others, less worthy of notice. Among the sects of this century we may reckon the Hernhut-ters or Mo-ravian Brethren, and the followers of Whitefield, Wesley, and others of the same stamp.	The French missionaries make many converts to popery in the Eastern parts of the world, in Carnate, Madura, the coasts of Malabar, China, &c. A great controversy occasioned by the indulgence of the Jesuits towards the Chinese in allowing them to perform the religious rites of their ancestors. Protestant missionaries sent to India by the English, Dutch, and Danes. The bull <i>Unigenitus</i> issued out by Clement XI, in the year 1713, condemns the New Testament of <i>Quenel</i> , and produces violent debates and divisions in the Gallican church; more especially between the Jesuits the great defenders of the bull, and the Jansenists its opposers. The Jansenists endeavour to support their declining credit by the pretended and fictitious miracles that were said to be wrought at the tomb of the <i>Abbé Paris</i> . The study of philosophy is placed on a new footing in Germany by <i>Leibnitz</i> and <i>Wolf</i> , and their method of demonstration is transferred to theology by several divines. <i>Christ. M. Pfaff</i> , a very learned and respectable Lutheran divine, forms a plan of reconcillation and	<i>Principal British Authors.</i> Sir Isaac Newton J. Flamstead Dr. Sam. Clarke Dr. R. Bentley Dr. Hare Joseph Addison Alexander Pope James Thompson M. Prior Sir R. Steele Dr. Jonath. Swift John Gay Dr. John Arbuthnot Dr. John Freind Dr. Edm. Halley Dr. Francis Hutcheson Dr. Campbell Mr. Balguy Mrs. Cockburn Dr. Con. Middleton Dr. Berkley, Bp. of Cloyne Lord Shaftsbury Lord Bolingbroke Dr. Th. Burnet Thomas Rowe Elif. Singer W. Wycherly Lord Somers William Lloyd John Hudson John and James Keil Colin M ^c Laurin Christ. Wren Jer. Collier Laur. Echard Dr. J. Woodward Th. Hearne Sir Hans Sloane Dr. Mead Martin Folkes Rev. Steph. Hales Thom. Simpson <i>Principal French Authors.</i> M. Malebranche B. Lami Lemery

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bps. of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics or Enemies of Revelation.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors, deceased.
Frederick V, now reigning			Oudin Bafnage De la Placette Martin		union between the Lutheran and Reformed churches; which bigotry and party-spirit hinder from being brought into execution.	Fenelon Jof. Sauveur P. de la Hire M. le Vaffor J. Fr. Simon M. Felibien H. de Larrey An. Dacier
Kings of Poland.			Spener Fechtius Maier Masius Wandalinus Luthenius Wincler Fabricius Schmidius Rechenbergius Ittigius Seeligmannus Loescherus Foertschius Buddeus Antonius Frankius Langius Maius Pritius, and others		<i>Sachewerel</i> an incendiary, who inveighs against civil and religious liberty, is impeached and censured.	<i>The De l'Isle's</i> Euf. Renaudot Tarteron Huet J. Le Long Andr. Dacier A Boulainvilliers James Bafnage Louis and Jean Boivin Ch. de la Rue P. Rapin de Thoyras J. and P. L. Savary Louis de Sacy Du Resnel Nic. L. De la Caille B. de la Monnoye Abbé Fraguier Gab. Daniel
Frederick Augustus III 1733 Stanislaus, elected, without taking possession Stanislaus, chosen a second time, but abdicates the crown Frederick Augustus II 1764 Stanislaus, Count Poniatowsky			N. B. The 20 writers last-mentioned, beginning with Spener, are Lutherans.		Lady <i>Moyer</i> , by her last will, founds a lecture, in which eight sermons are annually preached in defence of the doctrine of the Trinity.	G. J. du Verney Valincourt Geoffroi De la Mothe Joach. Le Grand J. Franc Felibien Sanadon Dumont Vertot Catrou Beaufobre Niceron De la Barre Melon De la Croze Vaniere Montfaucon Rollin Abbé Longuerue Abbé Banier Cardinal Polignac J. Baptiste Rouffseau Abbé Du Bos P. Brumoy L. Bourget Abbé Bignon Abbé de St. Pierre J. B. Du Halde G. H. Bougeant Marquis de Puy Segur
Kings of Portugal.			Romish Writers. Gonzales Beaugendre Papin Van Espen Fr. Lami Pouget Tomasi Le Br. Desmarets Dez D. de S. Marthe Hyac. Serri G. Helyot F. T. de Choisi L. E. Dupin J. Martiani C. Huré De Witte Huet L. Habert Cl. Fleuri Pope Clement XI Euf. Renaudot P. Constant P. de la Broue Ans. Banduri J. J. Boileau Marfollier Garnier J. Hardouin		The Protestant religion and the blessings of civil liberty established in Great-Britain and Ireland, by the accession of the house of <i>Brunswick-Lunenbourg</i> to the throne.	
Pedro II 1706 John V 1750 Joseph, now reigning					<i>William IV</i> raised to the stadholdership of the United Provinces, in the year 1747.	
Sultans.					An attempt made to assassinate <i>Lewis XV</i> , king of France, by a wretch, called <i>Damien</i> , who is supposed to have been instigated by the Jesuits to this odious deed.	
Mustapha II 1703 Achmet III deposed in the year 1730 Mahmout 1754 Osman II 1757 Mustapha III, now reigning					The order of the <i>Jesuits</i> is suppressed in France, their schools shut, and their revenues confiscated, in the year 1764.	
Czars of Muscovy.					The same order suppressed in Portugal, and its members banished.	
Alexiowitz 1715 Peter the Great 1725 Catharine 1727 Peter II 1730 Anne 1740 Ivan or Jean, deposed in 1741 and assassinated in 1764 Elizabeth 1762 Peter III 1762 Catharine, his Queen						
Stadtbolders of the United Provinces.						
William III 1702 This dignity remains vacant during the space of 45 years. William IV 1751 William V						

<i>Sovereign Princes.</i>	<i>Popes or Bps. of Rome.</i>	<i>Archbishops of Canterbury.</i>	<i>Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.</i>	<i>Heretics or Enemies of Revelation.</i>	<i>Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —</i>	<i>Profane Authors, deceased.</i>
<i>Kings of Prussia.</i> Frederick I, the first king of Prussia 1713 Freder. William 1740 Frederick III, now reigning			Bellegarde Maffillon G. Daniel Houdry Bianchini Echard Anselme Tournemine Duguet Longuerue M. Le Quien J. Longueval Orfini J. Fr. Baltus Vertot Gibert Boursier Ed. Martene C. de la Rue Blondel Montfaucon Sabatier Benoit L. A. Muratori Colbert Languet Dantine Houtteville Lenglet du Fresnoy Martin Berruyer De Caylus Bon. Racine Dom Aug. Calmet Benedict XIV J. le Boeuf R. Ceillier P. Maran Deschamps Orfi			Capperonier Alph. des Vignoles Abbé Desfontaines Mich. and Steph. Fourmont Mongault Bouhier Le Sage Fr. de la Peyronie Nicol. Freret Bellanger Gabr. Emilie du Chastelet De Stouches Abbé Teraffon H. Fr. d'Aguesseau Cl. Jos. Geoffroy Gasp. de Real Folard De Boze Mart. Bouquet De Moivre Lenglet C. S. de Montequieu Cl. Joly de Fleury James Cassini C. Chen. du Marfais Fontenelle Bouiller Castel Pèysonel Reaumur Le Monnier L. Le Gendre Goguet Boguer Maupertuis Velly, the Historian Abbé Salier Charlevoix Mascrier Le Boeuf M. Mirabeau Le Brun Morabin <i>Italian Authors.</i> Martin Poli Ant. Magliabechi Musitani M. Battaglini John Vincent Gravina J. M. Lancisi Ph. Buonanni

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bps. of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics or Ene- mies of Reve- lation.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors, deceased.
						Fr. Bianchini Jer. Zanichelli Just. Fontanini P. A. Micheli Eustachio Man- fredi Anf. Banduri Giannone L. A. Muratori Apostolo Zeno Scipio Maffei Cardinal Quirini James Cassini Buonamici Cardinal Passionei <i>Swiss Authors.</i> Daniel Le Clerc Em. Konig J. J. Scheuchzer James Hermann J. Le Clerc Werenfels J. Bernoulli J. P. Crouzas Burlamaqui <i>German Authors.</i> G. W. Leibnitz Chr. Wolf Baron Krosig Lud. Kuster H. de Coccei B. Ziegenbalg J. Mollerus J. And. Schmidt Crenius Thomafius Gundling T. F. Buddæus J. G. Eccard J. M. Lang J. B. Mencke J. Hubner J. L. Mosheim J. Alb. Fabricius Gasp. Neumann Chr. Wormius J. G. Heineccius J. G. Keyser P. Cantemir Jordan J. Offer, a Savede J. H. Bohmer Doppelmaier Winslow <i>Dutch Authors.</i> J. Perizonius Cuper

Sovereign Princes.	Popes or Bps of Rome.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Ecclesiastical and Theologic. Writers.	Heretics or En- emies of Reve- lation.	Remarkable Events — Religious Rites —	Profane Authors, deceased.
						J. Fred. Grono- vius S. Pitiscus B. Niewentite A. Reland Sallengre G. Noodt N. Hartsoeker Adr. Helvetius Herman Boerhave Albert Schultens Peter Burman Sig. Haverkamp Bynkershoek S'Gravesande J. Alberti P. Muffchenbroek Wesseling Gasp. Burman

I N D E X.

A.

A *BANO*, Petrus de, his character and ill treatment, vol. i. page 638. and (h).

Abassines (Ethiopians) receive christianity in iv cent. i. 176. See Abyssinians.

Abelard, Peter, i. 591. and (e) 599.

—— commentaries, i. 597.

—— polemic writer, i. 603.

Abelites, their tenets, i. 117.

Abgarus, story of him and Christ, whether true, i. 22. and (n).

Abraxas, used by Basilides, what, i. 112. and (q).

Abyssinia, Romish mission, ii. 357. how ruined, 358. and (t) and (u) several attempts for admission unsuccessful, 359.

Abyssinians, soon became Monophysites, i. 426, their state, ii. 134.

Academies, impious tenets, i. 9.

—— two in the empire, i. 82.

—— European state in xiii cent. i. 632. formed into universities, 633. heads and academical course, *ib.*

Acephali, sub-divisions, i. 272. why not to be admitted and extinguished by Baradaeus, 273.

Acominatus, Nicetas his polemic works, i. 689.

Adalbert, of Gaul, i. 375. condemned, 367.

Adamites, tenets, i. 117.

Adrian VI. pope, ii. 33. his instructions to the legate at Nuremberg, *ib.*

Adrian, emperor, his character, i. 71.

—— persecution under him, i. 77.

Æon, different meaning among Gnostics, i. 39. and (l).

Ærian, controversy, Leader's principal tenet, i. 202. their tenets 203. purpose to reduce religion to its primitive simplicity, with reflections, *ib.* and (g).

Africa, missions, ii. 304. success through the capuchins, 305. inaccuracy here, *ib.* (k) why alone employed, *ib.*

Africans, converted in the xv cent. i. 762.

Agapetus, his works, i. 293.

Agnoetæ, a Monophysite sect, in vi cent. decline, i. 309.

Agricola, his doctrine examined, ii. 168.

Albert, the Great, i. 637.

Albigenses, two senses of, and whence so called i. 700 and (o) cruel war against, and event, 701.

Albizi, Bartholomew, his book of St. Francis's conformities with Christ, i. 733. and number, 734. (k).

Alciat, banished Geneva, ii. 262. and (i).

Alcuin, i. 362. and (w) expositions, 364.

—— treatise of virtue and vice, i. 368. and (p) lives, *ib.*

Aldhelm, English prelate, i. 323. and (u) 326.

Alexander of Lycopolis, whether a christian, i. 283. (o).

Alexander III. pope, confirms the church's privileges, and extends his authority, i. 582. laws enacted, and successors, to Innocent III. 584.

Alexander

- Alexander VI.* pope, infamous character, i. 786. and (q). some writers suppose him to have been poisoned, ii. 5. and (c).
- Alexander VII.* pope (Chigi) his character, ii. 337.
- Alexander VIII.* pope (Ottoboni) his indolence, ii. 338.
- Alexandria*, patriarch's embassy to the pope, a Jesuit scheme, ii. 90. (l) and (m).
- Alfonfus*, Petrus, refutes the Jews, i. 603.
- Alfred*, his taste for letters in the ix cent. i. 386. works (w) learned men under (x).
- Alliaco*, Petrus de, labours to reform the schoolmen in xv cent. i. 798.
- Almamunis*, Caliph of Babylon, his zeal for learning in ix cent. i. 385.
- Almeric*, account of his opinions and followers, i. 635. and (t).
- Alphonfus X.* patron of learning, i. 632.
- Alva*, duke, his cruelty, gave rise to the Dutch republic, and through a prince of Orange's conduct, ii. 72.
- Alvarus's*, *Scintillae Patrum*, i. 408.
- Amalric*, his opinions, i. 707. and (c) chief disciple who, and whether he adopted Joachim's predictions, 708.
- Ambrose*, bishop of Milan, i. 189. and (i).
- Ambrose*, his three books on ministers duty, i. 196.
- Authpert*, account of, i. 362. his expositions, 364. his lives of saints, 368.
- America*, Romish missions, ii. 305. views of the Jesuits, 306. Labat's candid declarations, *ib.* (o), their ambition in Paraguay, 307. sub fin. (o).
- Americans*, converted in xv cent. i. 762.
- Ames*, William, his writings, ii. 227. and (p). ii. 481.
- Ammonius Saccas*, founder of new Platonics, i. 83. attempts a coalition of all religions, with his scheme, 84. chief articles, 85. moral discipline, *ib.* expresses his injunctions in scripture language, and pretended art of purging the sensorium, *ib.* his notions of God and Christ, i. 86. his philosophy how pernicious to christianity, and hence arose the mystics and monks, &c. *ib.* his sect, the rapid progress, i. 132.
- Ammonius's* harmony, i. 143.
- Amour*, Guillaumes de St. his opposition to the Dominicans, i. 660. his works, 661. (d). his character, i. 681.
- Amphilochius*, bishop of Iconium, i. 188.
- Amyraut*, Moses, his moral writings in xvii. cent. ii. 481. his change in the reformed doctrines, ii. 487. his reconciling system, what, *ib.*
- Anabaptists*, outrages committed by them and the effects, ii. 56. and (n) and (o).
- Anabaptists* (Mennonites) their history, ii. 232. origin obscure, and reason of their names, *ib.* (e) insincerity in declaring their opinions about re-baptism, 233. sub. not. (c), accounts of themselves and their adversaries, ii. 234. most probable account of their origin, *ib.* maxim whence their peculiarities, 235. different opinions among them about it, *ib.* drooping spirit revived on Luther's, &c. appearance, but not satisfied with his plan, 236. account of their first motions, *ib.* progress of their sect most infamously distinguished, 237. points of doctrine maintained by the most rational, *ib.* not all equally furious, 238. severe punishments inflicted on them, *ib.* and (n) indiscriminate severity, 239. of Munster, their madness and ring-leaders, 240. their madness in Holland, particularly Amsterdam, *ib.* (r) plot against the magistrates defeated, *ib.* measures for extirpating them, 241. state of such as escaped the severity of justice, and how comforted by Menno, *ib.* the question about their origin, how resolvable, 243 (u) discussed, 244. sub not. origin of the sects that have started up among them, *ib.* warm contest, and two sects rise, 245. how denominated, *ib.* and (x) confession of one sect, *ib.* (y) rigid, dissensions among them, and three sects, 246. source of their doctrine, and whether sincere in their public confessions, 247. religion late reduced to a system, and their leading principle, *ib.* their religion differs little from the reformed, with their peculiar tenets, 248. the fundamental principle on which their general doctrine is grounded, *ib.* how deviated from it, *ib.* and

- and (a), tenets in which all agree, 249. peculiar ones, and their system of morality, *ib.* primitive austerity greatly diminished, *ib.* and 250. particular opinions of some sects, *ib.* and 251, (c), state of learning and philosophy among them, 252. entirely rejected but among the Waterlandians, *ib.* they remit somewhat of their ancient rigour, *ib.* division into many sects and causes, 253. the first solid settlement in the United Provinces, and by what means, 254. English account of them, and two sects, *ib.* opinions of the general and particular Anabaptists, 255. account of a very singular sect called Davidists, 256. division into two sects, ii. 503. and (x).
- Anachorites*, who, i. 199.
- Anastasius*, how occasions Nestorian controversy, i. 264. his sentiments explained by Nestorius, and both keenly opposed, yet gain ground, *ib.*
- Anastasius* of Sinai, his works, i. 293, 297.
- Anastasius* of Palestine, his attempts against the Jews, i. 368.
- Andrew*, bishop of Crete, his homilies spurious, i. 323.
- Angelome*, monk of Lyfieux, his expositions, i. 407. and (r).
- Anglo-Saxons*, converted in vii cent. i. 311.
- Anhalt* Princes, how they became Calvinist, ii. 216. and (n).
- Anselm* of Canterbury, i. 483. and (o), and inventor of the argument ascribed to Cartes, his character, i. 524. improves Scholastic Theology, 528. first general system, 529. excellent moral writer, i. 530. defence of christianity, *ibid.*
- Anselm* of Laon, his character, i. 591, 597.
- Anselm*, bishop of Havelberg, his character, i. 604.
- Ansgar* converts the Swedes, &c. in ix cent. i. 378. his success and advancement, 379. and (a).
- Anthropomorphites*, in x cent. i. 464.
- Antidico-marianites*, tenets in iv cent. i. 227.
- Antinomians*, English, tenets and two forms, ii. 504.
- Antiochus*, monk of Saba, his works, i. 323, 325.
- Antonines*, their characters, i. 71.
- Antoninus Marcus* encourages only the Stoics, and the effect on learning, i. 81. his character as a Stoic, i. 82.
- Antoninus Pius*, persecution under him, i. 78. favourable edict to them, *ib.* and (x).
- Antony*, forms in Egypt solitary monks into a body, 197. how far they propagated over the East, and maxims of philosophy deceiving Christians, 198. account of that order in xi cent. 521. apocryphal and spurious writings, i. 50. and (q).
- Apollinarian*, heresy, author and tenets, i. 222. (c) and (d), fate, *ib.*
- Apollonius*, Tyaneus, account of his life by Philostratus, i. 130. comparison of Christ and him, pernicious, *ib.*
- Apologies* in ii. cent. i. 93.
- Apostles*, on the effusion of the holy spirit, preach with success to the Jews, &c. i. 24. one chosen, 25. founded many churches, 26. several fables related, *ib.* their authority, 43. they and disciples the chief writers, 49. creed, by whom composed, 53. instituted many rites, 58.
- Apostles*, account of a sect in xiii cent. so called, 709. leaders and extirpation, 710. and (b).
- Apostolic*, fathers, general character, i. 52.
- Apostolics*, account of that sect in xii cent. i. 619. tenets, *ib.*
- Apostolians*, Anabaptist sect, ii. 547. founder, his tenets and controversy with Haan, *ib.*
- Aquinas*, Thomas, Angelic Dr. raises Aristotle, i. 637. by a new translation of his works, *ib.* and (c), his character, i. 680. and (g) 684, 685. commentaries, 688. famous sum, 689. book against the Gentiles, 690.
- Arabian* philosophers, their opinions and reason of their name, i. 158. refuted by Origen, return to the church, *ib.*
- Arabs* in Spain converted in xiii cent. i. 627. driven out by the pope, 628.
- Arabs*

Arabs converted by Origen, i. 125.

Arator, his works, i. 294.

Arbrifelles, Robert, founds a monastery at Fontevraud in xii cent. i. 587. one singularity in his rule, and charge against him, 588. (*p*), some nuns in England, *ib.* and (*p*).

Archbishops, who, i. 182.

Archelaus, his character and banishment, i. 12.

Arianism, its rise, i. 216. tenets of its author, *ib.* and (*m*), its progress, 217. account of it after the council under Constantine's sons, 220. Constantius forces profelytes, by various calamities, *ib.* under Julian, who protects neither side, *ib.* Jovian, who declares for the Nicenians, 220. Valentinian, who extirpates the Arians in the west, *ib.* Valens, who favours the Arians, *ib.* Gratian and Theodosius the Great, both friends to the Nicenians, 221. excesses on both sides, *ib.* various sects, but in three classes, and bitter enemies to each other, *ib.* effects, and the indiscreet lengths gone, 222. their state in v. cent. 261. in vi cent. 305. progress, how prevented, 306. in vii cent. in Italy, 329. account of two famous writers in xvii cent. ii. 552. and (*w*), in xviii cent. 579.

Aristotelian, philosophy, its progress in viii cent. i. 345. to whom owing, *ib.*

Aristotelians, poor subterfuge before the inquisition in xv cent. i. 768.

Aristotle's explication of God and the soul, i. 10. his philosophy gains credit in v cent. 239. his works, why forbid at Paris, 708. different pursuits of his followers, ii. 80.

Arius opposes Alexander on the second person of the Trinity, i 216. expelled, defends his opinion with success, and draws Eusebius over, 217. Constantine, after admonitions in vain, calls a council at Nice, which condemns Arius, and declares Christ consubstantial, *ib.* invited to Constantinople, dies miserably, with some reflexions on the manner, i. 219. and (*y*).

Arius, how recalled from banishment by Constantine, i. 219. and (*x*), reinstated with his followers in their privileges, but refused a place among the presbyter, *ib.*

Armenia, Great and Less, receive the gospel early, i. 176.

Armenians, account of, ii. 135. three patriarchs, 136. their titular ones, *ib.* their state in xvii cent. 424. and (*y*).

Arminian, schism in xvii cent. ii. 483. decision of the Dort synod against their party, with the effects of their schism in Holland, England, and France, 484. Brandenburg and Bremen, 485. in Geneva, *ib.*

Arminianism, account of, in xvii cent. ii. 518. and (*b*), whence called Remonstrants, and commencement, *ib.* and 519. (*c*) and (*d*), progress, *ib.* endeavours of accommodation, why ineffectual, 520, justified by Grotius, *ib.* (*g*), five articles, 521. the first changed, *ib.* and (*h*), how the Calvinists judged these, *ib.* suspicions, why not entirely groundless, 522. prince Maurice declares against it, with his views, *ib.* and (*i*), resolves its ruin and patrons, 523. (*k*) and (*l*) assembles a synod at Dort for condemning it, 524. ancient and modern system, 527, 528. and (*y*), great end and principal heads, 529. and (*b*), confession of faith, 530. and (*c*), why no just account can be drawn from it, *ib.* and (*e*), present state, *ib.* adopted by the clergy of England, 531. among protestant princes, and in Holland, &c. *ib.* forms of worship and government, *ib.* and (*f*).

Arnaud, Anthony, escapes from France to Holland, and the consequences against the Jesuits, ii. 401. and (*w*).

Arnobius, character of his works, i. 139.

Arnobius, the younger, i. 248.

Arnold, Godfrey, character of him and his writings, ii. 460. his partiality, but quitted that when old, 461.

Arndt, John, his character and writings in xvii cent. ii. 467. his true christianity warmly opposed, and justified by others, *ib.*

Arsenius's

Arsenius's Synopsis, i. 679.
Artemon, his tenets, i. 118. uncertainty about these, 119.
Arts, seven, wretched manner of teaching in viii. cent. and division in Trivium and Quadrivium, i. 347. Cassiodore and Boethius recommended for further progress, *ib.*
Ascetics, whence produced, i. 96. why some Christians became such, *ib.*
Asculanus Ceccus, his character and fate, i. 719.
Asiatick, Gnostic sect, and tenets, i. 108.
Astefanus, his character, i. 747, 750.
Astrology, mixed with philosophy, reckoned magic, i. 719.
Athanaric, persecutes the christian Goths, i. 178.
Athanasius, account of him and his works, i. 187. and (*u*), refuses to restore Arius, i. 219. deposed by a council at Tyre, and banished, *ib.*
Atheists, few or none in xviii. cent. and those followers of Spinoza, ii. 563.
Athenagoras, account of him and his writings, i. 89.
Atto, bishop of Vercelli, his works, i. 455.
Audæus, forms a sect in iv. cent, i. 226.
Augsburg, confession, its authors, ii. 42. presented to the diet, and the effects on reading it, 50. by whom signed, with histories of the diet, *ib.* and (*c*), nature and contents, with its style, *ib.* and 51. and (*d*), refutation attempted by the Romanists, 51. answered by Melancthon, *ib.* their confessions, *ib.* and (*e*) three ways of terminating these disputes, 52. the third generally approved, but to no purpose, *ib.* and (*f*), Melancthon's character in the conferences, 53. imperial decree on proving ineffectual, *ib.* and (*g*), religious peace, 66. acts in favour of the Protestants, with the ignorance and superstition of the times evinced, 67, confession and defence, 147. and (*a*).
Augustin, bishop of Hippo, i. 189. and (*l*), character of his city of God, i. 234.

VOL. II.

Augustus, his base methods of obtaining power, i. 1.
Avignon, popes residence removed thither in xiv. cent. i. 722. diminution of their power, *ib.* new schemes invented by them to acquire wealth, 723.
Aurelian, state of the church under him, i. 129.
Aurelius Marcus, persecution under him, i. 78. listens to calumnies, and many apologies published, *ib.* many calamities suffered, 79. false accusers suborned by his judges, *ib.*
Ausonius, his character as a poet, i. 179.
Austria, commotions against the Protestants in xvii. cent. ii. 339. and (*p*).

B.

Bacon, John, i. 747.
Bacon, Roger, character of that Franciscan, i. 634. and (*g*), 635.
Bacon, Roger, the admirable Dr. his character, i. 638. and (*e*), ill treatment, 638.
Bacon, Lord Verulam, his character, ii. 320. and (*z*).
Baius, disputes about grace, ii. 121. accused and condemned by the pope, with his unjust treatment, 122.
Baldus, his character, i. 718.
Balsamon, Theodorus, his works, i. 591.
Bancroft's sermon at Paul's cross about the divine right of bishops exasperates their contest with the Puritans, and the effects, ii. 207.
Baptism, manner of celebration, in ii. cent. i. 105. when administered in vi. cent. 304.
Baradaeus, Jacob, restores the Monophysites in vi. cent. i. 307. his dexterity and diligence, *ib.*
Barbarians, western, persecute the Christians in x. cent. i. 440. and their effects for their conversion, *ib.*
Barcochebas's fury against the Christians, i. 77.
Bardejanes, account of that heretick and his doctrine, i. 110.
Barlaam's Ethics, i. 716. account of him, 746. finds fault in xiv. cent. with some Greek

- Greek monks, i. 753. the names he gives them, and defended by Gregory Palamas, 754.
- Barnabas*, account of his epistle, i. 52.
- Barnabites*, (regular clerks of St. Paul) founded, ii. 102. deviate from their first rule and their office, *ib.*
- Baronius's* annals, ii. 104. and (z), confutations, *ib.* (a).
- Barsumas*, a zealous Nestorian, i. 267.
- Barsumas*, abbot, brought the Eutychian opinions into Syria and Armenia, i. 271. but the former reject it, *ib.* and (h).
- Bartolus*, his character, i. 718.
- Basil*, bishop of Cæsarea, account of him and his works, i. 187. and (w), a council assembled there in xv. cent. reformation attempted in vain, 779. two points proposed, 780. demur between the fryars and pope, *ib.* decrees with the pope's dissolving this and summoning another at Ferrara, 781. depose Eugenius IV. and chuse Felix V. 782. fryars at Lausanne ratify Felix's abdication, and confirm pope Nicholas, i. 784.
- Basilides*, account of that heretic's tenets, i. 112. gems supposed to come from him, *ib.* and (q), enormous errors, 113. falsely accused of denying Christ's real body, 113. and (r), moral doctrine, 114. his errors, and how led into an enormous one, *ib.* and (s).
- Basilus*, See Bogomiles.
- Basilus*, of Seleucia, i. 246.
- Basilus*, the Macedonian, under him the Slavonians and Russians converted in ix. cent. i. 380. inaccurate account of the latter, by Lequien, *ib.* and (h).
- Bassi*, Matthew de, reforming Franciscan, ii. 100.
- Becker*, contest in Holland through his peculiar tenets, ii. 514. account of these in his *World bewitched*, and poor argument, *ib.* and (u).
- Bede*, venerable, account of him, i. 362. and (u), his explication of St. Paul and Samuel, i. 364. his moral treatises and lives, i. 368.
- Beghards*, See Beguins, in xiii. cent. i. 674. and (r).
- Beghards*, Lollards, in Flanders, account of, i. 678.
- Beghards*, severe edicts against them, in xiv. cent. i. 756. but not extirpated, 757.
- Beghards*, Schwestriones, in xv. cent. i. 803. and (h), leading principle, *ib.*
- Beghards*, by corruption Picards, horrible tenets, i. 804. severely used by Ziska, *ib.* and (i), called Adamites, and afterwards applied to the Hussites, *ib.*
- Beguins*, See Beghards, differences between the Franciscans of Germany and the Netherlands, i. 677, 678.
- Behmen*, Jacob, in xvii. cent. ii. 468. one of his chimerical notions, and his followers, 469.
- Believers*, in the church, who, i. 45.
- Believers*, distinction between them and Catechumens, i. 54.
- Bellarmino*, character of that polemic writer, ii. 113.
- Bellator*, character as a commentator, i. 296. translations of Origen, 299.
- Benedict*, abbot of Aniane, attempts in vain to reform the monks in ix. cent. i. 397.
- Benedict VI.* pope, history of him, and fate, i. 449. vii. 450.
- Benedict XII.* pope, his character, i. 726.
- Benedictine*, order, its rise in vi. cent. and the founder's views, i. 292. how degenerated, with a wise regulation not to change his rules, *ib.* rapid progress in the west, and the promoters, *ib.* their sudden success to what owing, 293.
- Berenger*, his commentary on the Revelations, i. 527. introduces logic and metaphysics, 528. controversy about the Lord's supper in xi. cent. 534. though condemned, persists in his opinion, 535. abjures his opinions, but teaches them soon afterwards, *ib.* after publick recantation with an oath abjures them, 536. makes a second solemn declaration before pope Gregory VII. and subscribes a third confession with an oath, 537. yet retracts publicly and composes a refutation, *ib.* and (z), whence appears Gregory's sentiments of the Eucharist, *ib.* *sub. not.* fate

- fate and progress of his doctrine, 538. his real sentiments, 539. and (c), weakness of the arguments by Roman Catholics against it, *ib.* and (d), the church had not yet fixed the manner of the presence, 540, *sub fin. not.*
- Bermudes*, John, sent into Abyssinia as patriarch, ii. 89. a mistake about Loyola, *ib.* and (g), little or no success, *ib.*
- Bernard*, St. aggrandizes the Cistercians, i. 585. apology, 586. and (b), answered by Peter of Clugni, *ib.* his character, 591. and (c) 598. chiefly opposes the schoolmen, 601. charge against Abelard, *ib.* and (t), also against Gilbert de la Porrée, 602.
- Bertram*, Ratramn, monk of Corby, i. 400.
- Beryllus's* error about Christ refuted by Origen, and returns to the church, i. 157.
- Bessarion*, how employed among the Greeks in the council of Florence, i. 782. terms of reconciliation with the Latins, but not lasting, 783.
- Bessarion*, cardinal, his character, i. 791.
- Beza*, character of his Latin New Testament, and notes, ii. 225.
- Biblicists*, their number diminished in xiii. cent. i. 686.
- Bishops*, appointed first in Jerusalem, and their office, i. 48. how far their power was extended, *ib.* their authority increased by councils, 88. first acknowledge themselves delegates, but soon claim authoritative power, *ib.* disputes between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople in vi. cent. 288. mistakes in the account of them, *ib.* and (r), their authority, 182. four have pre-eminence, *ib.* their ignorance in vii. cent. 318. bishops and abbots enlarge their jurisdiction and prerogatives in x. cent. 452.
- Bizochi*, in xiii. cent. who, i. 674. divided into two classes, 676. and (s).
- Blanc*, Lewis le, a reconciling doctor of the reformed in xvii. cent. ii. 489. and (w).
- Blandrata*, propagates Socinianism in Transylvania, ii. 273.
- Blommada*, Nicephorus, account of, i. 631, 679.
- Blessensis*, Petrus, refutes the Jews, i. 603.
- Blois*, Peter, his works, i. 592.
- Blount*, Charles, ii. 315. and (i).
- Bockhold*, taylor of Leyden, account of, ii. 240. his short reign and sad end, *ib.*
- Boethius*, account of him, i. 286. the only Latin philosopher in vi. cent. *ib.* his character, 295.
- Boetius* and *Baldwin*, dispute between them in xvii. cent. ii. 466.
- Bogomiles*, author amongst the Greeks in xii. cent. i. 609. tenets and name, what, *ib.*
- Bohemia*, commotions in xv. cent. i. 794. the troubles how ended, 797.
- Bohemia*, commotions against the Protestants in xvii. cent. ii. 340. who defend themselves, and chuse Frederick V. king, *ib.* and (a), account of the war, *ib.* dreadful consequences to king Frederick and the Bohemians, 341. how defeated, *ib.* and (r) and (s), the war unfavourable to the confederates, with the emperor's proceedings, 342. Gustavus Adolphus intervenes, and conclusion of the thirty years war, 343. the peace of Westphalia, and advantages to the Protestants, *ib.* and (x), the pope frustrated, 344. and (y).
- Bohemian*, Moravian, brethren, their reformation, ii. 214.
- Bolfec*, Jerom, ii. 230. treatment from Calvin causes a breach between the latter and J. Bourgonne, *ib.*
- Bonaventura*, his character, i. 680. and (g), commentaries, 688.
- Boniface* V. enacts the law for refuge in churches in vii. cent. i. 329.
- Boniface*, Winifrid, converts the Germans in viii. cent. i. 338. and (c), his other pious exploits and advancement, *ib.* murdered with fifty more, 339. the judgment to be form'd about his apostleship, *ib.* and (d). account of, 362.
- Borri*, Joseph Francis, romantic notions, ii. 412. condemned to perpetual imprisonment, *ib.* and (w).
- Bosius*, his tenets in xvii. cent. ii. 463.
- Bossuet*,

- Bossuet**, his attempt to reconcile the Protestants, ii. 350. and (*u*), followed by others on private authority, 351. a commission to some, but in vain, *ib.* and (*x*).
- Boulainvilliers**, character of him, and defence of Spinosa, ii. 319. and (*y*).
- Bourignon**, Antoinette, account of, in xvii. cent. ii. 557. and her main principle, *ib.*
- Brabantinus**, Thomas, treatise on bees, i. 751.
- Bradwardine**, Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, his character, i. 718. his book on Providence, i. 751.
- Breckling**, Frederick, account of in xvii. cent. ii. 471. and (*b*).
- Bredenburgh**, John, account of that collegiant, and debate with Cuiper, in xvii. cent. ii. 554. (*z*).
- Brescia**, Arnold, his seditions in Italy in xii. cent. i. 614. his tenets, 615.
- Brethren**, and Sisters of the free spirit, See Beghards, in xiii. cent. i. 702. (*r*) and (*s*), various names, 703. and (*t*), mystical doctrine and tenets, with impious conclusion, *ib.* sentences from more secret books, 704. (*w*), some of eminent probity among them, *ib.* others infamously licentious, 705. and (*y*), different explications, 706. and (*z*), place of their origin, *ib.* and (*a*).
- Brethren**, and Clerks of the common life, account of them in xv. cent. i. 789. two classes, *ib.* and (*i*), sisters of this society, 790.
- Brethren**, white, in xv. cent. account of, i. 805. and (*k*), how extinguished by Boniface IX. *ib.* and (*l*).
- British**, ecclesiastics preach the gospel with success in the viii. cent. i. 311.
- Brito**, Guil. his character, i. 634. and (*i*).
- Britons**, whether converted as early as king Lucius, i. 73.
- Brown**, George, archbishop of Dublin, his vigour in reforming that diocese, ii. 70. his character, *ib.* and (*l*), Mosheim's mistake here, and queen Mary's cruel designs in Ireland prevented, *ib.* (*m*), deprived under her, but the reformation goes on under queen Elizabeth, 71.
- Brownists**, sect of Puritans and founder, ii. 211. notions of church government, 212. and (*u*), retire to the Netherlands, 213. fate on their founder's renouncing his separation, *ib.* (*x*) and (*y*).
- Bruno**, two of that name, i. 525. commentary, 527.
- Bryennius**, Josephus, his works, i. 790.
- Bucer**, Martin, attempts to reconcile the Reformed and Lutherans, ii. 192. how defeated, *ib.*
- Budnæans**, Socinian sect, ii. 279. character of their tenets and founder who is excommunicated and re-admitted, 280 and (*t*), followed by William Davides and Franken, *ib.*
- Burchard**, character of his Decreta, i. 455.
- C.**
- Cabbala**, the source of errors among the Jews, i. 17.
- Cæcilianus**, bishop of Carthage, condemned, with the reasons alleged for it, i. 211. opposed by Donatus, 212. and (*e*).
- Cælestius**, account of, i. 274. and (*y*).
- Cæsarius**, of Arles, his works, i. 294, 298.
- Cajetan**, cardinal, character of his Exposition of the Bible, ii. 110.
- Cainites**, their tenets, i. 117.
- Calixtines**, in Bohemia, what, and their four demands, i. 795.
- Calixtus**, his opinions, ii. 450. and (*f*), his real design, 451. *sub fin.* and (*f*), two great principles, with debates carried on with the doctors of Rhintelen, Koningsberg, and Jena, 452. Glassius's candid examination, 453. and (*k*).
- Calistus**, Nicephorus, his character, i. 716. his works, 746.
- Calvin**, John, facilitating a reconciliation of the Reformed and Lutherans, ii. 193. and (*g*), error here, *ib.* set on foot the contest about predestination, 194. his opinion, and that of the old Swiss doctors, 195, the former propagated with the discord carried to the greatest height, *ib.* founder of the Reformed church

- church, 197. and (*e*), his grand views how in part executed, 198. and (*p*), doctrine and ecclesiastical government, altered in three points from that of Zuingle, 199. first, the power of the magistrate, second, the eucharist, little different from the Lutherans, tho' much from Zuingle, 200. (*q*) and (*r*), different from the Romanists, *ib.* third, in God's absolute decree, *ib.* changes by him not received by all the reformed, 201. gains ground in Germany and in France, 202. in Scotland, by Knox, 204. in England, *ib.* contest with the spiritual libertines, 228. with those of Geneva, *ib.* rigid discipline, and resolution in establishing, 223. and (*d*), differs widely from Zuingle, with the endeavours of the cantons and clergy to adopt it, vain, 224. his great character, 49. (*a*) and (*b*), saved often by Margaret of Navarre, retires to Basil, and publishes his Institutions, *ib.* his excellent Commentary of Scripture, 225. why sharply censured, *ib.* and (*l*), institutes, *ib.* and 226. his practical divinity, 226. progress, how retarded, 227. his disputes with Castilio, 229. Balsec, 230. and Ochinus, *ib.*
- Calvinists*, secret, favourers in Saxony, ii. 179. attempts to spread their doctrine, 184. consequences, 185. with the death of Crellius, their chief patron, *ib.*
- Camadolites*, their origin, i. 518.
- Camaterus*, Andronicus, his works, i. 591.
- Camerarius*, his character, ii. 155.
- Camerarius*, Joachim, his Commentary on the New Testament, ii. 159.
- Campanella*, account of his philosophy and character, ii. 81. (*p*).
- Campanus*, John, account of his heresy, ii. 259.
- Canon*, of Scripture, when fixed, i. 49.
- Canons*, their origin, in viii. cent. i. 359. excellent design, *ib.* (*h*). favoured by Lewis the Meek, i. 397. who institutes the first canoneses with a new rule, condemned, *ib.* and (*b*), author of it, 398. partiality of their historians, *ib.* (*i*), account of that order in xi. cent. distinction into secular and regular, i. 522. why called regular canons of St. Augustin, 523. and (*p*), introduction into England, *ib.*
- Canons*, regular, their useful Lives and Manners in xii. cent. i. 586. investives between them and the monks, with the abettors on both sides, 587.
- Canons*, Roman, their luxurious lives, ii. 99.
- Canacuzenus*, John, his character, i. 716. his works, 746.
- Capito*, Robert, account of, i. 634, 635, 681. his commentaries, 688.
- Cappel*, Lewis, contests through reconciling concessions in xvii. cent. ii. 488. (*q*) (*r*) (*s*), zealously opposed, *ib.*
- Capuchins*, origin of that order, ii. 100. envy against them, and whence so called, 101. (*m*) and (*n*).
- Caputiati*, fanatics in xii. cent. and their views, i. 619.
- Cardan*, method of philosophizing, ii. 80. (*m*).
- Cardinals*, privileges in electing a pope, by William, granted, i. 490. and (*e*), exclusively of any other, 491. origin and nature of that office, 492. appears from pope Nicholas II's edict, and why it could not pass into a law, 493. how remedied by Alexander III. 494.
- Cardinals*, in Rome, number, ii. 84. obstacles to some of them being chosen pope, 85. and (*a*).
- Carlostadt*, his character and intemperate zeal, ii. 32. his opinion about the Eucharist contrary to Luther's, and illustrated by Zuingle, 34.
- Carmelites*, origin in xii. cent. i. 589. glaring absurdities, about, 590. and (*y*), progress in England, *ib.* and (*y*), two branches, ii. 101. and (*r*), separated, and again subdivided, 102.
- Carpathius*, John, his discourses, i. 367.
- Caro*, (Cher) Hugo de St. his works, i. 681. and (*l*), 684.
- Carpocrates*, that impious heretick's tenets, i. 114. which destroy all virtue, 115.
- Cartes*, M. des, character of him, ii. 326. his philosophy, 327. method adopted, and the clergy alarmed, *ib.* metaphysical, improved and propagated with success, ii. 331. by Malebranche and

- and Leibnitz, with the character of each, *ib.* and (*r*), other sects oppose him, and the consequence to science, 328. his method applauded, yet several essential faults found, *ib.* Gassendi his chief adversary, *ib.*
- Cartesian*, contest in Holland, account of, ii. 510. philosophy, why charged with impiety by Voet, and an alarm raised, 511. edicts against it, but ineffectual, *ib.*
- Carthusians*, order in xi. cent. account of, i. 520. founder, and severe laws, *ib.* and (*h*), why so few nuns of that order, 521.
- Cassian*, his character, i. 247. and (*q*).
- Cassiodorus*, his character, i. 295. character of his works, 296.
- Castalio*, Sebastian, his character, ii. 229. and (*y*), banished Geneva, is received into Basil, *ib.*
- Castiglione*, Gilbert de, refutes the Jews, i. 603.
- Catechumens*, in the church, i. 45. distinction between them and believers, i. 54. differently instructed, *ib.*
- Catharists*, among the Latins, in xii. cent. their origin and tenets, i. 610. two principal sects, with their doctrine, and subdivisions, 611. church constitution and discipline, 612.
- Celsus*, objections, refuted by Origen, i. 80.
- Ceremonies*, multiplied in ix. cent. origin of which several writers explain, i. 423. the bad effects hence, and a general account of these rites, 424.
- Cerintus*, and followers, tenets, i. 69.
- Chains*, what so called by the Latins, i. 297.
- Chalcedon*, iv. general council, deposes and banishes Dioscorus, i. 270. and (*d*), receives Leo's famous epistle to Flavianus, and the doctrine established, *ib.*
- Chalcidius*, whether a Christian, or no, i. 282. (*n*).
- Chapters*, controversy about the three in vi. cent. i. 300. and (*o*), condemned by Justinian, and warm opposition, 301.
- Charity* feasts suppressed in v. cent. i. 258.
- Charlemagne's* expedition against the Saxons in viii. cent. and views, i. 340. their aversion to christianity, and the reasons, *ib.* (*h*), his methods for converting and retaining the Saxons, 341. also among the Huns in Pannonia, and judgment about his views in these, 342. about the miracles in this cent. *ib.* revives learning among the Latins, thro' the assistance of Alcuin, 346. orders cathedral and monastic schools to be erected, also the Palatine school, but not with the desired success, 347. account of his works, i. 361. expositions, 364. renews former grants, and adds new donations to the see of Rome, 354. which cannot be ascertained, 355. and (*u*), his motives, *ib.* and *sub* (*u*), opportunity for the western empire, which he lays hold on, 356. and (*y*), his rights, *ib.* and (*z*), his zeal for studying the scriptures, 364. misses his aim, and how, 365. and (*g*), his zeal for the Romish rites, 374.
- Charles*, the Bald, a great patron of the sciences, 386.
- Charles*, V. emperor, his interview at Bologna with the pope, about a general council, and that prelate's answer, ii. 42. listens to Paul III's sanguine counsels, 60. the Protestants raise an army, *ib.* his real views, 65. disconcerted by Maurice of Saxony, *ib.*
- Charles I.* of England, ii. 346. three objects of his administration, 495. entrusts the execution of his plan to Laud, *ib.* dissensions with the parliament increase, 496. they abolish episcopal government, and bring him to the scaffold; with reflexions, and the conduct of the Puritans, *ib.*
- Charles II.* ii. 347. state of the church under him and his successors, 506. act of uniformity, *ib.* and (*f*), consequences to the Nonconformists, and fluctuating state, 507.
- Chaumont*, French ambassador to the king of Siam, with the latter's acute answer to the former's memorial, ii. 292. (*q*).
- Clarendon*, xvi. constitutions, i. 580. *sub* not.
- Clarke*, Dr. Samuel, account of, ii. 579. his tenets about the Trinity, *ib.*
- Claudius*, Bishop of Turin, his works, i. 399. and (*u*), his noble stand against image &c. worship, and his cause triumphant, 412. his heresy, ii. 259.
- Celestine*, pope, sends missionaries to Ireland in v. cent. i. 232.

Cellite, Alexian, sect in xiv. cent. i. 744.

Celts, learning among, ii. 42.

Cene, Charles le, propagates Pajon's doctrine (see Pajon) ii. 491. his singular translation of the Bible condemned, *ib.* and (b); he rejects original sin and human impotence, &c. 492. and (c).

Century i. its ecclesiastical history, i. 1.—ii. 71.—iii. 122.—iv. 163.—v. 228.—vi. 279.—vii. 310.—viii. 337.—ix. 378.—x. 431.—xi. 465.—xii. 550.—xiii. 621.—xiv. 711.—xv. 761.—xvi. ii. 3. xvii. 283.—xviii. 559.

Cerdo, account of him and his tenets, i. 109.

Ceremonies, how multiplied in v. cent. i. 258. general view of the new rites, *ib.* multiplied in vii. cent. i. 328. additions made by every pope, with several examples, 329. multiplied in viii. cent. in several respects, i. 374. multiplied in x. cent. i. 461. to what owing, 462. in xi. cent. i. 541. endeavours used to introduce the Latin liturgy every where, *ib.* this point left to be determined by single combat and fiery trial in Castile, 542. absurdity of not permitting worship in the mother tongue, with the reason, and the same absurdity in the East, 583. still multiplied, *ib.* augmented among the Greeks and Latins in xii. cent. 607. multiplied in xiii. cent. i. 692. ridiculous, and those with regard to the eucharist, *ib.* and (r), institution of Corpus Christi, and its origin, 693. and (s), year of jubilee added, *ib.* and (z), useless ceremonies remain in xvii. cent. ii. 124. where most prevalent, 125. (n).

Cerularius, Michael, account of, i. 524. revives the contest between the Greeks and Latins, 531. accuses the Latins of several errors, *ib.* disgusted at the pope's arrogance, with the violence on both sides, 532. adds new accusations, *ib.*

Calcedon, contests after that council, i. 270.

China, christianity when introduced, and by whom, i. 310. the state of christianity in xiv. cent. 712.

China, missions, ii. 292. their astonishing success, 293. owing to the Jesuits, with their dexterity in the arts and sciences, *ib.* progress of christianity,

how prevented, with a change in the affairs, 294. great success, *ib.*

Chinese, famous monument at Siganfu, i. 310. and (a).

Charepiscopi, origin of, i. 48. 48. why suppressed, 182. and (g).

Christ chuses 12 apostles and 70 disciples, i. 21. reason for this particular number, 22. same spreads beyond Judæa, *ib.* conclusions from the miserable state of the world at his birth, 11. his birth when and where, 20. and (z). accounts of him in the four gospels, and his life, 21. success of his ministry, 22. prejudices of the rulers against him, and Judas's treason, 23. his death, resurrection, and ascension, *ib.* pours out the Holy Ghost on his apostles, 24. highly respected among the Gentiles, 26. extraordinary teachers, 42. institutes only Baptism and the Lord's supper, 57. hence a number of ceremonies not essential, 58. comparisons falsely drawn between the philosophers and him, 130. dispute in ix. cent. about his birth, 419.

Christian religion, two main points, i. 53. assemblies, where and when first held, 103. worship, many ceremonies multiplied in ii. cent. 99. reasons for such changes, *ib.* and (m), remark of Bolingbroke, *ib.* in fine. first reason, 100. passage in Gregory Thaumaturgus's life illustrating this, *ib.* and (n), second reason, with a remark thereon, 100. third reason, 101. fourth reason, *ib.* fifth and sixth reason of this increase, 102. an example illustrating the last reason, *ib.* its progress in the East in vi. cent. 79. converts retained their savageness, *ib.* in the West, by Remigius, when Clovis became Christian in Britain, by Augustin and Columbus, *ib.* in Germany, *ib.* yet retain their idolatrous rites, 281. and (i), Christian disputants, spurious books among those of iii. cent. 145. missionaries in vi. cent. principal injunctions on their proselytes easy, 282. its doctrine, and state in iii. cent. 139. three methods of explaining its doctrine in vi. cent. 297. 298.

Christianity, causes of its rapid progress supernatural, i. 27. miraculous gifts by the apostles furthered it, *ib.* ascribed to

to absurd causes, 28. its progress in the Roman empire, 71. its rapid progress, to what ascribed, 73. retarded by unjust calumnies, *ib.* and (*l*), its enemies in Europe, ii. 78. this how modified, *ib.* its primitive simplicity retained, i. 90. but soon altered, 91. proved by a striking example, *ib.* the Platonists attempts against it, 129. vitious method of defending it in iii. cent. 144. prejudice received in iv. cent. from the philosophers, 175. middle way between it and the ancient theology revived by Struchtmeyer of Harderwyk, *ib.* and (*m*), its progress in iv. cent. 176. cause of it, 177. its progress in v. cent. 229. German nation converted, 230. the reason, 231. Franks converted, *ib.* Irish, and the causes, 232. conversions how far due to real miracles, 233. opposed in v. cent. by secret enemies, 236. spoken and written against in vi. cent. 283. how first conveyed to Siam, Tonquin and Kochin-china, ii. 290. its enemies in England in xvii. cent. 309, 315. audacious in Charles II. reign, the ingenious treatises in defence of religion, and Boyle's lectures founded 310. Burnet's abridgment of these, *ib.* and (*y*), by whom introduced into China, 310. propagated in viii. cent. among the Scythians within Imaus, 337. and (*a*), the Jews compelled in vii. cent. to embrace it, 313. how corrupted in viii. cent. 362. its sad state in ix. cent. 401. ignorance and superstition apparent from the stupid veneration for saints and relicks, 402. though their canonization by councils partly restrained saint-making, yet it added power to the pope, 403. which was enlarged by their lives being written by monks, *ib.* forgeries of the latter severely censured, 404. the various motives, *ib.* fondness for relicks, the consequences, 405. its propagation in x. cent. 431. into Tartary, *ib.* propagated in xi. cent. 465. its state in xii. cent. in the West and North, 561. sufferings in the East from the Saracens, 562. true reasons, *ib.* from Genghizcan's successes in the North of Asia,

563. more and more corrupted in xii. cent. 593. chief causes among the clergy, *ib.* its state in the North of Asia and China in xiii. cent. 621. how extirpated, and papal embassies into Tartary, 622. its unhappy state in xiii. cent. in the East, 628. and (*z*), its state in China and Tartary in xiv. cent. 712. loses ground in Asia in xiv. cent. 714. its decline in China and Tartary, 715. its decline in the East in xv. cent. ii. 63. its divine simplicity, whence apparent, 57.

Christians, ten persecutions of them by the Gentiles, i. 29. what emperors made laws against them, 30. why persecuted by the Romans, and most odious calumnies spread abroad, 31. apologies for them, and refutation of hereticks serviceable, 74. miracles, extraordinary gifts, *ib.* community of goods among the first, 25. punishments and judicial processes against them, 32. why persecuted under Nero, 34. and (*t*), extent, *ib.* learning amongst them in ii. cent. 86. different opinions about its utility, 87. why persecuted by Domitian, and the martyrs who, 35. primitive, had a perfect equality among them, 45. divided into believers and catechumens, *ib.* first, their care in educating their youth, 54. their schools and gymnasia different, 55. lives and manners, *ib.* controversies early among them, and the first, 56. the most important about the terms of acceptance and salvation, 57. about the necessity of observing Moses's law, *ib.* unanimously set apart the first day for public worship, 58. seventh day also observed by Jewish converts, 52. likewise their festivals and places of assembling, *ib.* manner of public worship and its essential parts, 60. the Lord's supper, feasts of charity and baptism, with the sick anointed, and fasting introduced, 61. calumny against them, refuted by Justin Martyr's apology, 78. rendered odious by calumnies 80. at Alexandria, why they follow the new Platonics, 83. unanimous for the scriptures, 92. pious frauds among them, whence, 98. lives and excommunication

munication how employed, *ib.* penitential discipline gradually modelled by the heathen mysteries, 99. whether expedient, *ib.* calamities in iii. cent. and privileges increased under several emperors, 122. how increased, 124. causes partly divine, partly human, *ib.* under Decius, renounce the faith, and the opprobrious names given them, 127. certificates from the Pagan priests, *ib.* and (s), warm debates occasioned by this defection, when the lapsed desired re-admission, and this lenity opposed by Cyprian, 128. attempts of the Jews against them in iii. cent. 131. state of learning among them in iii. cent. 133. its utility warmly debated and prevails, *ib.* chiefly owing to Origen, 134. proceedings of other philosophers, *ib.* affairs reduced to a dangerous crisis, by Diocletian's persecution, 163. state of learning among them, 180. many illiterate, *ib.* bad lives in iv. cent. with the causes 209. universal corruption, and controversies frequent, 201. in the Roman empire in v. cent. suffer from the barbarous invaders, 234. attempts of the Pagans on an obsolete plea to destroy their credit fruitless, and desperate notions how introduced, 235. sufferings in v. cent. in Gaul, Britain, and Persia, from the Pagans, 235. from the Jews, 246. state of letters among them, 237. in the West, how damped by the savage invaders, and almost totally extinguished, 238. their sufferings in vi. cent. in Britain from the Anglo-Saxons, 283. from the Huns, 284. from the Lombards till they became christians, and in Persia from Cosroes, *ib.* in Germany, &c. persecuted by the Pagans in viii. cent. 344. persecuted by the Western barbarians, and the effects, 440. their suffering in xi. cent. under the Saracens and Turks, 476. under those in the Western provinces, and from the Pagans still among them, 477. how affairs in Tartary change in xii. cent. in favour of them, 554.

Christiern II. desirous to promote the Reformation in *Denmark*, and his motives, ii. 45. but deposed, and the reasons, VOL. II.

ib. and (r), the different conduct of his successor Frederick, *ib.* how he finished the Reformation in *Denmark*, by Bugenhagius, 46. and confined by the States at Odensee, *ib.*

Chrysostom, account of him and his works, 187. (y) and (z).

Church, in general, and Romish in particular, its prosperous state in xviii. cent. ii. 589. ambiguous converts made by the latter, 560. controversy about the Chinese Christians using their ancient rites, with two papal edicts, and the effect in China, *ib.*

Church, Dutch, its state in xvii. cent. ii. 577.

Church, Eastern, its history, and division into three communities, ii. 126.—Greek, properly speaking, and the two branches, with its four provinces described, 127. (o) (p) and (q).

Churches, Eastern, separated from the Greeks and Latins, ii. 133. two classes, and their names, and subdivision, *ib.* and (b), state in xviii. cent. particularly the Russian, 568.

Church, of England, its state under James I. ii. 492, 495. under Charles I. *ib.* its state in xviii. cent. 575. members divided into two classes, 576. warm debates by Dr. Hoadley and Dr. Potter, *ib.* and (c), its spirit appears from Dr. Wake's project of union between the English and Gallican churches, *ib.* and (d).

Church, Greek, history and sad state in xvii. cent. ii. 414. some exceptions, 415. and (a), invincible aversion to the Latin church, *ib.* and (b), methods for softening it under Urban III. and the laborious productions on this plan, 416. and (d), doctrine whether corrupted by the Romish missionaries, ii. 418. and (g), whence, with bribery, &c. of the Jesuits, in obtaining testimonies from the Greeks about some Romish points, 419.

Church, Helvetic, what points first excited divisions between them and the Lutherans, ii. 196. adopt Zuingli's about the Eucharist, 197. and (n).

Church, Lutheran, (Evangelical) reason of its name and commencement, ii. 146. substance and formularies of its doctrine, 147. public worship and ceremonies, 148. visible head and form of government, 149. (*f*) and (*g*), liturgies, 150. public worship, and method of instructing, *ib.* holidays, 151. and (*h*), ecclesiastical discipline, and excommunication, how brought into dispute, few prosperous and calamitous events, 152. and (*k*), allegations, of their enemies against the religious peace, unjust, 153. and (*n*), state of learning, with the study of the Belles Lettres and languages, 154. authors. eminent therein, *ib.* various fate of philosophy among them, 155. sects among them, 156. and (*s*), science of theology corrected and improved, 158. exegetic theology, its state, *ib.* respective merits of interpreters, 159. two classes, 160. didactic theology in xvi cent. *ib.* how its form changed, 161. morality, state and writers thereon, *ib.* and (*a*), why no regular system, 162. controversial theology, with change introduced, *ib.* asperity in disputants, how alleviated, 163. three periods to be distinguished in the history, *ib.* debates between Luther and Fanatics during the first period, and who the latter were, 164. and (*d*), also between him and Carolostadt, with the occasion, 165. (*g*) (*h*) and (*i*), and Schwenckefeld, 166. and Antinomians, 168. debates in the second period between the death of Luther and Melancthon, 169. methods to heal divisions how frustrated, 178. form of doctrine projected, and James Andreæ employed, 179. judgment concerning the controversies in it, 186. some private controversies in xviii cent. 465, 466. and (*x*), losing ground in Hesse, *ib.* and Brandenburg, 428. state of moral science among them, 446. principal writers, success and contests, whence, 447. two classes combated by a third, *ib.*

Church, Reformed in France, particular tenets in xvii cent. ii. 485. the occasion of departing from their brethren in some points, with some correction about con-

cessions of moment to popery, 486. and (*k*), controversy raised by the hypothetical universalists, *ib.* Cameron and Amyrant's attempts, with the form of reconciliation by the latter, *ib.* and 487. controversies about predestination and grace in xvii cent. 482. its state in xviii cent. 573. impeachment of candor here, *ib.* (*w*) (*x*) (*y*), groundless asperion removed, 574. and (*x*), projects of re-union between them and the Lutherans improved in England, 575. by what means retarded; and the project of Dr. Pfaff, *ib.* and (*b*).

Church, Romish, great schism in xiv cent. i. 728. good and bad consequences, 729. high character of its pontiffs in xviii cent. 563. indifferent figure which the modern popes make, 564. all prospect of reconciliation between it and Protestants entirely removed, with intestine divisions among the Romanists, 565. Jesuits and Jansenists compared, and the increase of the former in Holland, *ib.* and (*y*), debates through F. Quenel's New Testament, and account of that work, *ib.* and 566. condemned by the pope's bull Unigenitus, with the commotions in France thereon, *ib.* at length registered by the parliament, with the two methods by which Jansenism is supported, 567. pretended miracles by the remains of abbé Paris refuted, *ib.* and (*r*), their visions, *ib.*

Church, Romish, proposals for abolishing its schism, i. 729.

Church, rulers, how called, i. 45. character and office, 46.

Church, Russian, change introduced by Peter I. ii. 420. who patronizes learning, 421. and pursues their salutary measures; also changes its manner of government, which he assumes as emperor, *ib.* and (*p*), and entrusts to the holy synod, 422.

Churches, modern, their history, ii. 146.

Church, more ancient, ii. 335.

Church, Romish, its history, and popes, in xvii cent. ii. 335.

Circumcelliones, in Africa, origin, i. 213. horrid ravages, and defeat by Macarius, at the battle of Bagnia, 214.

Cistercian,

Cistercian, monks in xi cent. origin, i. 518. great law, 519. prosperity in xii cent. 585. owing to St. Bernard, with jealousies between them and monks of Clugni, *ib.*

Claudius, state of the church under him, i. 120.

Clemangis, Nicholas de, his character, i. 791.

Clemens, bishop of Rome, his epistles, i. 50. and (r) (t), other writings falsely attributed to him, 51. and (w).

Clemens, Alexandrinus, his works, i. 90. Commentary on the Scriptures lost, 92. treatises on morality, lost, 94. his work against hereticks, 94.

Clement, of Ireland, his character, condemned, i. 376. and (k).

Clement V. pope, obsequious to Philip the Fair, i. 724.

Clement VI. contest with Lewis of Bavaria, i. 727.

Clement VII. ii. 33. his orders to Campegius at Nuremberg against Luther, seconded by the emperor, 34. answer of the princes, and declaration of those who retired to Ratisbon with the legate, and two occurrences retard the Reformation, *ib.*

Clement VIII. Caldobrandini, ii. 335. and (a).

Clement IX. Rospigliosi, ii. 337. (b). — Pope, Altieri, *ib.*

Clement XI. Albani, high character, ii. 338.

Clementina, Spurious, i. 145. and (n).

Clerks, apostolic, account of that order, and its abolition, i. 743.

Clerks, regular, rise in xvi cent. ii. 102.

Clergy, their marriage in iii cent. i. 137. concubinage, how introduced, and who, 138. this custom not abolished till long after, *ib.* their vices in iii cent. 136. assume temporal majesty, and hence arose lesser orders, with their names, and nature of their office, 137. and (t). their vices in iv cent. whence, 186. vices in v cent. 244. sources, and this corruption how reconcileable with so many saints, 245. corruption in vi cent. to what owing, 290. edicts of little efficacy, the bishops of Rome not excepted, a double election, *ib.* four councils held to end this schism, with Ennodius' adu-

latory apology for the pope, who was not fairly acquitted, 291. (b) and (c), papal power, how founded, *ib.* advantages to the Romish see from the attachment of its bishops to the kings of France, 353. Pepin's donation to that see, which he renews, and the causes, 354. and (t). their corruption in ix cent. 389. causes, 390. in x cent. 446. principal vices in x cent. 453. corruption in xi cent. 485. manners in xii cent. 571. corruption in xiii cent. 639. in xiv cent. 720. vices in xv cent. 769. and keen complaints against them, *ib.*

Clergy, inferior, corruption in xvi cent. ii. 9. the reason why, *ib.*

Clergy, Roman, state in xvi cent. ii. 98. some advantages procured them at the pope's expence, 99. manners of the higher, *ib.* reason of their corruption, lower orders not so dissolute, 100. their state in xvii cent. 370. why corrupted, with several exceptions, 371.

Clovis, how induced to embrace Christianity, i. 231. prodigy of the phial of oil at his baptism, an imposture, *ib.* and (o), from him arises the title of Most Christian, 232.

Clugni, monks in xi cent. their power, i. 517. and (w), bad effects, *ib.* jealous of Cistercians, 585.

Clugni, Benedictines, degenerate in xii cent. i. 585.

Codinus, George, his works, i. 791.

Couciens in Holland, account of, in xvii cent. ii. 509.

Cœnobites, i. 199. and (u).

College de propaganda fide founded at Rome in xvii cent. ii. 283. number of members, *ib.* and (a), business, 284. another by Urban VIII. *ib.* those of the same nature in France, and altercations of their missionaries, with those of the Jesuits, 285.

Collegiants, disputes among and their opponents, ii. 554. and (x).

Collegiants, Rhinsbergers, Socinian sect in xvii cent. ii. 552. (u), and 553. comprehensive community, 554. how united, *ib.*

Callyridians, sect in iv cent. i. 227.

Columbanus, account of, i. 291. 295. and (u). his

- his success in preaching in vii cent. i. 311.
- Comestor*, Petrus, his works, i. 592.
- Commentaries*, chains of them in ix cent. i. 406.
- Commentators*, why many weak and chimerical, i. 250. strain the Old Testament into allegories, 251. in vi cent. two classes, 296.
- Commentators*, Latin, in ix cent. i. 406.
- Commentators*, allegorical, in ix cent. i. 407. general principle, and number of senses, *ib.* their merit in x cent. 459. defects in in xi cent. 527. in xii cent. 596. in xv cent. 797.
- Commodus*, state of Christians under, i. 79.
- Commission-court*, high, account of, ii. 208. (*p*), exorbitant power, *ib.* in *fine*. principles laid down by it, 209. how answered by the Puritans, *ib.*—211.
- Conception*, immaculate, contest about, in xii cent. i. 607. additional veneration paid the Virgin, 608.
- Concord*, form, account of, ii. 148. and (*c*), 181. compilers, and account of, 182. and (*c*), purposes for which used, *ib.* produces much disturbance, and opposed by the Reformed, even by the Lutherans themselves, 183. their different motives, with Julius of Brunswick's conduct, 184. why rejected in his dominions, *ib.*
- Confessors*, whence so called, i. 32. veneration paid them, perverted, and their number, 33.
- Confucius*, religious worship paid him by the Chinese, ii. 299. (*z*).
- Congall*, British Abbot, persuades many to a monastic life, with his disciples success, i. 891. singular rule of his disciple Columban, *ib.* and (*f*).
- Congregation* of aid, why so called, ii. 124. and (*m*).
- Congregation* of cardinals, their business, ii. 85. (*c*).
- Congregation* of the holy sacrament in France, and founder, 285.
- Constance* council, why assembled by Sigismund, i. 771. design and issue with regard to the grand schism, 772. issue a decree against Wickliff's writings and ashes, 778. another, taking the cup from the laity, and why, with their sentence against Dr. Petit, but not ratified by pope Martin V. 779.
- Constans* obtains all the western provinces, till assassinated by Magnentius, i. 171.
- Constantine's* accession, restores peace to the church, i. 166. civil war hereupon, *ib.* defeats Maxentius, 167. grants the Christians power to live according to their laws, with different opinions about his faith, yet gives proofs of his sincerity, 168. whether influenced somewhat from worldly motives, *ib.* influence of Christianity and superstition compared, *ib.* and (*x*), story of the cross seen by him in the air, attended with several difficulties, and hypotheses about it, 169. and (*a*), his colleague Licinius persecutes the Christians, who, after several battles, is strangled, 170. efforts against Paganism, and encouragement of Christianity, *ib.* his three sons succeed him, who massacre all their relations but two, 171. and (*c*). model'd ecclesiastical government to the civil, 182. divided it into external and internal, 183. how he and his successors called councils, &c. 183. raised in the bishop of Byzantium a rival to Rome, i. 185.
- Constantine II.* allotment of dominions, i. 171. in a war with his brother loses his life, *ib.*
- Constantius* sole emperor, i. 171. death and successor, *ib.*
- Constantine* Porphyrogenneta, an encourager of learning, and his works, i. 441. and (*e*), what detriment he caused to letters, 442.
- Constantinople*, bishop's authority how increased, i. 185. in a council there placed next after the bishop of Rome, and privileges further extended, with the disagreeable effects, 186. honours accumulated on its bishop in v cent. 240. œcumenical council, 301. points condemned in it, *ib.* and (*r*), disputes between that bishop and Rome about pre-eminence, 320. granted the latter by Phocas, *ib.* council under Photius confirms image-worship, and anniversary festival, 411. taken by the Turks in xv cent. 763. effects on Christianity, *ib.* patriarch, ii. 127. his power and revenue, 128.

- Controversial* writers against heretics many, but few extant, i. 93. in ii cent. *ib.* skill and defects, *ib.* of iii cent. good and bad qualities, 94. the chief in iv cent. 195. in xiv cent. 751.
- Controversies*, few in viii cent. 368.
- Controversy*, many managers of it in v cent. against worshiping images, pagan deities, against Jews and sectaries, i. 252. defects in these disputants, which give rise to spurious writings, 253. about predestination and the Lord's supper, why silenced in x cent. 456. different sentiments about the latter, 457. and (*t*), between the Greeks and Latins in x cent. 460. why revived in xi cent. 531. Greek emperor's endeavours to stifle it, but Leo IX's legates enflame it, 532. new, about the sanctity of images, with the decisions, 533. about the Lord's supper, 534. continued in xii cent. 603. champions on each side, and breach how widened, 604. continued in xiii cent. 690. salutary measures ineffectual, yet an accommodation takes place, 691. which is declared null, *ib.* in xiv cent. 751. between the university of Paris and Dominicans, 752. between Realists and Nominalists continued in xv cent. 768. different fates, *ib.*
- Controversy*, religious, in xvi cent. ii. 113.
- Controversy*, adiaphoristic, or about indifferent matters, in xvi cent. between Melancthon and Flacius, ii. 171. the two questions discussed, gave rise to the dispute about the necessity of good works, 172.
- Controversy*, synergistical, ii. 172. and (*a*), the principal champions, 173.
- Constantius Chlorus's* mild government in Gaul, i. 165. western provinces enjoy peace under him; and, on his death in Britain, his son Constantine saluted Augustus, 166.
- Conversions* in ix cent. nature and views, different from the preceding, i. 380. religion of missionaries corrupted, and traces of idolatry among their converts, accounted for, 381.
- Conversion* of Jews and Moors in Spain by force in xv cent. i. 761.
- Copiate* in the church, i. 137. and (*t*), in *fine*.
- Copts*, misery, how relieved, ii. 134. and (*l*).
- Corbinian*, preachers among the Germans in viii cent. i. 339.
- Cordt*, Christian Barthol. Bourignonist, in xvii cent. ii. 557.
- Cortesi*, Paulus, commentary on Proverbs, i. 799.
- Cosmas*, bishop of Jerusalem, i. 361.
- Council*, general, at Constantinople, decision against images, rejected by the Romanists, i. 371. and (*u*).
- Councils*, general, meeting why retarded by pope Clement VII. ii. 55. and (*i*), who eludes his promise, and dies, *ib.* and (*k*), his successor Paul III. willing to convoke one, *ib.* and (*l*), why protested against by the Protestants, 56. (*m*), who draw up the articles of Smalcald, *ib.*
- Councils*, whether any in i cent. and when, i. 48. whether that at Jerusalem was one, 49. and (*l*). their origin, and canons encrease the bishops power, 88.
- Crellius*, Samuel, in xviii cent. ii. 579.
- Cresconius*, his works, i. 324.
- Crescens's* efforts against Christians and Justin Martyr, i. 80.
- Cromwell*, state of the church under, ii. 503. tolerates all but Episcopalians, with his singular favour for Independants to balance the Presbyterians, *ib.* and (*t*).
- Crown* of the Virgin, institution in x cent. i. 462. and what, 463.
- Crusades*, renewed in xiii cent. with taking Constantinople twice, i. 623. duration of the Frank empire there, *ib.* and (*b*), another, in which they take and lose Damietta, *ib.*
- Cusa*, Nicholas de, his works, i. 792. labours to reform the schoolmen in xv cent. 798, 799.
- Guiper*, Francis, his contest with Bredenberg in xvii cent. ii. 554. (*z*).
- Cyprian*, opposes re-admitting the lapsed, and gets the better, i. 128. suffers under Valerian, *ib.* character of his works, 139. his moral writings, i. 143.
- Cyriac*, of Ancona, introduces a taste for coins in xv cent. i. 766.
- Cyril*, bishop of Jerusalem, his works, i. 187. and (*x*), famous catechetical discourses, i. 193.
- Cyril*.

Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, i. 245. and (g), Commentaries on the Scriptures, i. 250. and (d), anathematizes Nestorius twelve times, 264. in what blameable in Nestorian controversy, 266. and (s), anathematized at Ephesus by John of Antioch, *ib.*

Cyrillus, patriarch of Constantinople in xvii cent. favourable to Rome, his fate, ii. 417. and (f).

D.

Damascenus, John, plain view of Aristotle's doctrines in viii cent. excites many to study them, i. 345. character, 361. Commentary on St. Paul, 363. four books of faith and parallels, 367. his treatise of errors, 368.

Damianists, in vi cent. founder and tenets, i. 309.

Damianus, Petrus, morality, unsuccessful against the Jews, i. 524.

Dancers, a sect in xiv cent. i. 759.

Daniel, Gabriel, defender of the Jesuits, ii. 117. (z).

Dante, his character, i. 717.

Darensis, Johannes, explications of the pretended Dionysius, i. 368.

David, Francis, propagates Socinianism in Transylvania, ii. 273. adopts Budnæus's sentiments about Christ, with his imprisonment and death, 280. and (u).

Davidists (David-Georgians) Anabaptist sect, ii. 256. impiety of the founder, why exaggerated, *ib.*

Deacons in Jerusalem, i. 46. whether the young men who carried out Ananias and Sapphira were so, *ib.* (g).

Decius, horrid persecution under, causes defection, i. 127.

Decretals of popes, by whom compiled, i. 639.

Deists, tolerated under Cromwell, and their heads, ii. 504. different classes, and the least extravagant, with their tenets, 563. *Essential Religion*, its author, and refutation, *ib.* and (n).

Demiurge, among the oriental philosophers, his character, i. 40.

Denmark, Christianity established in x cent. i. 435. beginning of Reformation by

Christiern II. ii. 44. promoted by his successor Frederic, 45. Calvinism introduced, but opposed by the Lutherans, ii. 217. and (p).

Desiderius, bishop of Cahors, epistles, i. 323.

Deurboff, notions in some treatises in xviii cent. ii. 577.

Diadochus, his works, i. 253.

Dinant, David, fundamental principle, i. 707.

Dion Cassius combats barbarism in iii cent. i. 132.

Dioceses, origin, i. 48.

Dioclesian, persecution under, how procured, i. 164. causes, and horrid severity, *ib.* and (f), brings matters to a sad crisis, 165.

Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus, account of, i. 188.

Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, high character, i. 138.

Dionysius, the Areopagite, a Greek fanatic under that name, in iv cent. gloomy tenets, i. 197. and (n).

Dionysius, pretended Areopagite, his works, i. 298. 408. and (u), translated, *ib.* and (w), his life, by Hilduin, 409.

Dionysius, the Little, his works, i. 294.

Dionysius, the Geographer, i. 564.

Dionysius, the Carthusian, i. 799.

Dionysius, chief of the Mystics, i. 799.

Dioptra, by Philip the Solitary, i. 602.

Dippelius, his fanatical character, in xvii cent. ii. 461. also his works, 462. (q).

Disciples LXX, their authority, i. 43.

Discords between Greeks and Latins, seeds sown in vii cent. i. 328.

Divines, didactic, in xiv cent. i. 748.

Divines, school, their adversaries in xiv cent. i. 749. in xv cent. hated and opposed chiefly by the restorers of polite literature, 799.

Divines, mystic, in xiv cent. i. 748.

Divines, biblical, in xiv cent. i. 749.

Divinity, systematic, none in ii cent. i. 92.

Divinity, polemic, state in iv cent. i. 194. disingenuous methods of disputing, *ib.* state in xv cent. i. 799.

Doctors, Christian, two classes in xii cent. manner of expounding, i. 599. opposed from different quarters, 600. effects and issue, 601.

Doctrine,

Doctrines, secret, among antient Christians, i. 55.

Doctrines, fathers of the Christian in France and Italy, by whom founded, ii. 102.

Dodwell, Henry, high-church writer, and controversy, ii. 508.

Dominicans, reputation in xiii cent. i. 656. founder, 657. names, and first foundations, *ib.* and (*r*), eminent services done the popes, 658. dispute between them and the university of Paris in xiii cent. i. 659. pope's decision in their favour, 660. St. Amour their formidable adversary, *ib.* authority, why considerable in xvi cent. ii. 10. yet declines, *ib.* why, *ib.* their infernal plot and imposture at Bern, *ib.* and (*k*), discovery, and fate of the actors, *sub not.*

Domitian, why he persecutes the Christians, i. 35. the martyrs, who, *ib.*

Donatists, rise of the controversy with, i. 211. whence so called, 212. and (*e*), dispute with Cæcilianus, i. 212. lose their cause in 2 councils, and before the emperor Constantine, with a proof of his supreme power, 213. and (*g*), on their bitter reproaches against the emperor, &c. are deprived and banished, some being put to death, and hence the Circumcelliones, *ib.* severe proceedings against them, after their defeat at Bagnia, 214. and (*b*), their state under Julian and Gratian, with two causes of their decline, and their principal crime, 215. in v cent. 259. on the council of Carthage's request, how treated by the emperor Honorius, *ib.* in vi cent. how they dwindle, 305.

Dorotheus, abbot of Palestine, his works, 323. 326.

Dort, synod, assembled in xvii cent. for condemning Arminianism, ii. 524. proposal of the Arminians, rejected, and their design, are excluded from the assembly, and condemned, 525. and (*o*), judgment about this synod, *ib.* (*p*) and (*q*), fate of the Arminians after it, and a colony settled in Frederickstadt, 526. leading men, 527. recalled from exile, they found a college in Amsterdam, and its professors, *ib.*

Dulcinus, head of the apostles sect, his courage and fate, i. 709.

Dunkelsputil, Nicholas, his zeal in reforming the monks of Germany in xv cent. i. 787.

Dunstan, of Glassenbury, his works, i. 455. and (*p*).

Durandus, of St. Portian, account of, i. 747, 748.

Dursians, Durusians, account of, ii. 140.

Dutch, their zeal in the American provinces for the gospel, how retarded, ii. 309. and (*u*), success in Surinam inconsiderable, *ib.* and (*w*), theological contests among them in xvii cent. ii. 509.

Duytz, Rupert, his character, i. 592, 597. refutes the Jews, 603. sentiments of the Eucharist, and other religious contests, 606.

E.

East, remains of ancient sects, ii. 138.

Eastern, disputes in ii cent. about keeping it, 103. occasion, and progress prevail chiefly between the Asiatics and Romans, 104. from these is drawn a striking argument against the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, *ib.* and (*u*), the dissension stopt by Irenæus, and the Asiatic Christians Letter, 105. the celebration made the same by the council of Nice, *ib.* disputes between the Britons and Anglo-Saxons in vii cent. i. 328.

Ebionites, account of them, i. 70. their origin, 106. gospel, *ib.* and (*e*), doubtful whence derived, 107. their doctrines pernicious, *ib.* and (*h*).

Eccard, Henry, a brother of the free spirit, i. 757.

Eclectics, their tenets, i. 11. who and whence, 83. prefer Plato to all others, *ib.*

Eclectics, philosophers so called, method, ii. 333.

Eginard, account of, i. 362, 587. his elegant work, 399. and (*t*).

Egyptian sect of Gnostics, their tenets, i. 108. how different from the Asiatic Gnostics, and various leaders, 112.

Elcesaites, heretics, i. 108.

Elfric,

- Elfric*, of Canterbury, his works, i. 455. and (q).
- Eligius*, Eloi, bishop of Limoges, his works, i. 323.
- Elipand*, archbishop of Toledo, his heresy, i. 366. and (k).
- Elizabeth*, queen, her character, and her religious establishment, ii. 68. her propensity to Romish usages, 205. and (l), oppresses the Puritans, 206.
- Elizabeth*, princess Palatine, favour for the Labaddists, ii. 555. and (c).
- Elliot*, John, his success in converting the Indians, ii. 309.
- Elxai*, and followers, account of their heresy, i. 108.
- Emperors*, Christian, their severity against Paganism in iv cent. why levelled against the multitude, i. 174.
- Empire*, Roman, state against Christ's appearance, i. 1. advantage of its extent to mankind and Christianity, 2. enjoys peace at Christ's birth, *ib.* this circumstance necessary to the success of the gospel, *ib.*
- Empire*, Eastern, its decline in viii cent. and causes, i. 342.
- England*, its advantages for literature in vii cent. to whom owing, i. 319.
- England*, the court of Rome fails in its attempt against it, ii. 346, 347.
- England*, some nuns there, in xii cent. i. 588. and (p).
- England*, private enemies of Christianity in xviii cent. ii. 562. list of them, with some mistakes corrected, *ib.* (l) and (m).
- English*, propagating Christianity in America, ii. 78. obstinately reject the plan of Geneva, with the dissensions, and two parties thereon, 222. this schism, how prevented from extending to the Reformed abroad, and maxim laid down to this purpose, 223. and (b), their missions in America, 307. particularly Independants and Puritans, 308.
- Ennodius*, bishop of Ticinum, his character, i. 229.
- Ephesus* III. general council, i. 265. deprives and banishes Nestorius without hearing, *ib.* and (n), the doctrine established, *ib.* judgment unprejudiced about this controversy owing to Cyril, 266. and (q).
- Ephesus*, council there, why called an assembly of robbers, i. 269.
- Ephraim*, the Syrian, account of him and his writings, i. 188. and (d).
- Epicetus*, his character as a Stoick, i. 82.
- Epicureans*, their impious tenets, i. 9. and (c), why in greatest reputation, i. 82.
- Epiphanius*, account of him and his works, i. 187. and (a).
- Erasmus*, of Rotterdam, account of, i. 790.
- Erasmus*, character of his Latin New Testament and Paraphrase, ii. 110.
- Eremites*, Hermits, their character, i. 199. and (u).
- Ernest*, Justinian, plan for propagating the abroad how prevented, ii. 303.
- Ernest*, of Saxe-Gotha, his design of instructing the Abyssinians, by abbot Gregory, who is shipwrecked, ii. 423. next by Wanselb, and how disappointed, *ib.* and (x).
- Essenes*, their tenets, i. 14, 15. division into theoretical and practical, 16. moral doctrines, and bad influence on the people, *ib.*
- Ethiopians*, See Abassines and Abyssinians.
- Evagrius*, account of his Ecclesiastical History, i. 293.
- Evangelists*, who, i. 42.
- Eucharist*, controversy in ix cent. about it, 413. in ix cent. produces unseemly recriminations, 415. continued in xiii cent. about Christ's presence, i. 691.
- Euchites*, Messalians, sect in iv cent. whence so called, i. 226. extensive meaning of their title, 227. in xii cent. account of, i. 608. and (m), among the Orientals, 609.
- European*, nations, conversion attempted in vain in xi. cent. i. 466.
- Eusebius*, answers Hierocles's works against Christianity, i. 175.
- Eusebius*, bishop of Cesaria, account of him, i. 186. whether an Arian, 187. and (s).
- Eustathian*, troubles, i. 201. the leader of this sect chargeable with fanaticism, 202.
- Eustathius*, bishop of Antioch, i. 188.
- Eustathius*, bishop of Thessalonica, his commentaries on Homer, i. 564.
- Eustathius*,

Eustathius, his character, i. 591.

Eustratius, his works, i. 590.

Eutyches's supposed doctrines, i. 274.

Eutychian sect, its founder, and directly opposite to Nestorius, i. 268. for his sentiments about Christ excommunicated and deposed by Flavianus, *ib.* and (*a*), but appealing is acquitted in a council at Ephesus by Dioscorus, who scourges Flavianus publicly, 269. and (*c*), state in vi cent. i. 396.

Eutychius, bishop of Alexandria, his character, i. 443. account of him, i. 454.

Excommunication, use in the church, and in whom vested, i. 56.

Expositors, in vi cent. their defects, i. 296.

Æthefis, edict by Heraclius, and the contests about it, i. 333. received in the East, but rejected by pope John IV. *ib.*

F.

Fanatics, infest the Greeks in xii cent. i. 608.

Farnovians, Socinian sect, author and eminent disciples, ii. 281.

Fabricius, John, controversy through his mild sentiments in xviii cent. ii. 573.

Felix II. of Rome, deposes and excommunicates Acacius bishop of Constantinople, i. 273. articles alleged, and true reasons with new contests, *ib.* and (*s*).

Fenelon, contest between him and Bossuet, with their characters, ii. 410. adopts some of Madame Guyon's sentiments, *ib.* (*p*) and (*q*), his book condemned through his adversary's artifice, 411. remarkable conduct differently interpreted, *ib.*

Ferrara, council by pope Eugenius ix cent. i. 781. removed to Florence, 782. and endeavours to reconcile the Greeks and Latins, *ib.*

Festivals multiplied in vi cent. i. 304. instituted in xiv cent. 753.

Ficinus, Marcilius, famous Platonist, i. 799. a truth of christianity, a treatise by him, 800.

Fifth-monarchy men in xvii cent. ii. 503.

Finlanders, converted in xii cent. i. 551. founder of their church, with his severity and fate, 552.

VOL. II.

Firmin, preaches in viii cent. i. 339.

Flacius, Matthias, glossary of scripture, &c. ii. 159.

Frederic, promotes the Reformation in Denmark, by the edict at Odensee, ii. 45. finished by his successor Christiern III. 46.

Frederic II. emperor, accused of impiety in xiii cent. i. 630. the evidence not sufficient, *ib.* encourages learning, i. 632. has Aristotle translated, 636.

Fronto's wretched attempts against Christianity, i. 80.

Frumentius converts the king of Abassia in iv cent. i. 176.

G.

Gal, St. propagates the gospel, i. 311.

Galenists, anabaptist sect, ii. 547. their founder and tenets, 548.

Galerius, Maximian, persecution under him, i. 129. deposing Dioclesian, assumes the Eastern empire, 165. sufferings of the Christians under him, 166. after unheard of cruelties, orders the persecution to cease, *ib.*

Gallienus, state of the Christians under him, i. 128.

Gallus, persecution under him, i. 128.

Gassendi, his philosophy in xvii cent. ii. 326. attacks Aristotle and his followers, *ib.* and (*b*), also Fludd and Roscru- fians, *ib.* his wise method of investigation, ii. 326. why chief adversary of des Cartes, 328. accurate abridgment of his philosophy by Bernier, *ib.* and (*m*), has not many followers, yet the few he had were eminent, 329. particularly in England, *ib.* mathematical sect, its progress, 332. favourably received in Britain, and by Sir Isaac Newton, *ib.* and (*s*).

Gaul, by whom converted, and churches there settled, i. 125.

Gauls, Narbonne, rise of the inquisition, i. 696.

Gauls, learning among them, i. 41. their conversion when, 73. converted by Martin in iv cent. i. 177.

Geneva, form of ecclesiastical government, ii. 221. and (*z*), rejected by the English, 222.

4 O

Gentilli

- Gintilli* council, in viii cent. about the derivation of the Holy Ghost, i. 373.
- Georgians*, in Asia, converted in iv cent. i. 176. miserable state, ii. 132.
- Gerhard's* introduction to Joachim's Everlasting Gospel, i. 665. and (*w*), detestable doctrine 666. suppressed by the pope and publicly burnt, 667.
- Germans*, their conversion, i. 72. and (*f*), converted in viii cent. by Winfrid (Boniface) 338, &c. their apostles preach among them, 339.
- Germanus*, his works, i. 679.
- Germany*, by whom converted, i. 125.
- Gerson*, John, his works, i. 791. labours to reform the schoolmen in xv cent. 798, 799.
- Ghost*, Holy, error about its origin, i. 366. and (*l*), controversy about its derivation, 373. and (*b*), about the procession continued, 413. pope Leo III. his decision, *ib*.
- Gilbert*, the universal bishop of London, i. 597.
- Gnostics*, less considerable sects, i. 117. leading sect, i. 63. who comprehended under that name, and their origin whence, with pernicious errors about the scriptures, 64. impious opinions about Christ, *ib*. moral doctrines of two different kinds, 65. how supported by fable and stratagem, and whence the dissensions among them, 66.
- Godescalc*, monk of Orbais, i. 400. begins a controversy in ix cent. on predestination and grace, 416. twice condemned, and inhumanly treated, *ib*. history of this contest, with his followers and opponents, 417. his tenets, and how interpreted by his followers, with those maintained by his opponents, and the judgment to be formed, 418. (*q*) and (*r*), dispute between him and Hincmar about Trina Deitas, *ib*.
- Godofred*, the Norman, conquering Friesland, embraces Christianity in ix cent. 383.
- Gospel*, what countries it enlightened, i. 72. many countries receive it in iii cent. i. 125. several Northern provinces receive it in xii cent. i. 550. judgment to be made of their conversion, 554.
- Goths*, in Mysia and Thrace, how converted, i. 125. ravages in the Western empire in v cent. 228.
- Grace*, disputes about it in xvi cent. ii. 120. various controversies about it, i. 278. Augustine's opinion, in explaining which his disciples never agreed, *ib*. and (*k*).
- Granianus's* remonstrance to Adrian for the Christians, has effect, and to what owing, i. 177.
- Gratian's* Epitome of Canon Laws, i. 568.
- Greece*, state of learning, i. 41.
- Greek*, study in xiii cent. i. 634.
- Gregory*, the Great, his character as a commentator, i. 296.
- Gruet*, Libertine of Geneva, bitterly attacks Calvin, ii. 229. his impious tenets and fate, *ib*.
- Gun-powder* plot, ii. 346. remarkable passage in one of the conspirator's letters, *ib*. and (*g*).
- Guido*, Guy Juvenal, attempts reforming the monks in France in xv cent. i. 787.
- Gustavus*, Vasa Ericson, promotes the Reformation in Sweden, ii. 43. and (*m*), publishes Petri's translation of the Bible; and permits the archbishop of Upsal to make another, *ib*. and (*n*), appoints a conference between Petri and Gallius, with the former's victory and effects, 44. resolved at Westeraas to admit the Reformation, and why the clergy oppose it, *ib*. and (*o*).
- Guyon*, Madame, account of her writings, ii. 409. and (*o*), her sentiments refuted by Bossuet, 410. controversy between him and Fenelon, *ib*.

H.

- Hales*, Alexander, irrefragable Dr. i. 637, 681, 684.
- Harald*, first establishes Christianity in Denmark, i. 435.
- Harmenopulus*, Constantinus, his works, i. 591. polemic writer, and character, 603.
- Harmonies*, Lutheran, of the gospel, ii. 159.

Hattermist,

- Hattemists*, Dutch sect in xvii cent. ii. 516. impious tenets, and those peculiar from the Verschorists, with their perverse tendency, *ib.*
- Heidegger*, form of concord and fate, ii. 517. and (z).
- Hemerobaptists*, account of, ii. 138. and (b).
- Henoticon*, by Zeno, i. 272. subscribed, yet produces contests among the Eutychians and Partisans of the council of Chalcedon, 273.
- Henricians*, account of that sect in xii cent. i. 613. and (y).
- Henry VIII.* of England, renounces the papal supremacy, ii. 57. and (p), the reasons for it not fairly represented, *ib.* and (q), expedient suggested to the king by Cranmer and the effects, 58. and (r).
- Heracian's* book against the Manichæans, i. 304.
- Herbert*, of Cherbury, lord, account of, ii. 313. instance of fanaticism, 314. and (g), his peculiar tenets, by whom refuted, 315. and (h).
- Heresies*, remains of the ancient in vi cent. i. 404. revived in v cent. 259. continue in x cent. i. 463.
- Heretics*, dispute in iii cent. about their baptism, i. 146. determination for it, by the Asiatics and Africans, with Stephen bishop of Rome's violent proceedings, 147.
- Heric*, monk of Auxerre, said to have anticipated Descartes, i. 389.
- Hermits*, and monks, rise, i. 141.
- Hermogenes*, his tenets, i. 119. and (a).
- Herrenbutters*, account of them, in xviii cent. ii. 570. their flagitious practices, 571. and (s).
- Hesychius*, moral writer in vii cent. i. 326.
- Hetzer*, Lewis, account of his heresy, ii. 259.
- Heyling*, of Lubec, his pious labours in Ethiopia, in xvii cent. ii. 423. and (u).
- Hierocles's* works against the Christians answered by Eusebius, i. 175.
- Hilary*, bishop of Poitiers, account of, i. 188. and (f).
- Hildebert*, archbishop of Tours, account of, i. 525. his body of divinity, 529. and (d) and (e), morality, 530.
- Hildebrand*, Gregory VII. pope, i. 495, 466. bold exploits, 597. success of his ambition, 498. familiarity with Matilda, and her grant to the see of Rome, 501. (n) and (o). his decrees against concubinage and simony in the clergy, 502. and (p), severe proceedings against the former, cause many tumults, 503. and (q), he and his adherents branded as Paerini, *ib.* and (r), severity in two respects criminal, 504. and (s), tumults about investitures thro' his laws against simony, 505. and (u), death and character, 513. (see *Investitures*).
- Hilduin*, of St. Denis, *Areopagitica*, i. 399.
- Hincmar*, archbishop of Rheims, i. 400. exposition of kings, 406.
- Hippolitus*, his character and works, i. 138. and (y), his commentaries on Origen's plan, i. 143.
- History*, ecclesiastical, i. 1. and *seq.*
- History*, of the church, the method of treating it in xvi cent. why changed from that in the preceding centuries, ii. 1. two heads—1st general, its extent, *ib.*—2dly particular, and this subdivided into two parts—of the Reformation, *ib.* its improvements in xvii cent. 322. the innumerable advantages of it, *ib.* view of it in xviii cent. 559.
- Hobbes*, character of him, ii. 310. adherents and apologists, 311. (a), his writings, and whether he recanted, *ib.* and (b).
- Hoe*, Matthew, defence of the Protestants, ii. 339.
- Hoffman*, Daniel, disputes between him and colleagues, ii. 157.
- Holidays*, number diminished by Urban VIII. ii. 413.
- Homilies*, origin, i. 365.
- Honorius*, pope, embellishes churches in vii cent. i. 329. favours the doctrine of one will in Christ, 332. attempts to save his infallibility, *ib.* (q).
- Hospitallers*, knights, origin, valour, and removal to Malta, i. 560.
- Hugenots*,

Hugonots, derivation of that word, ii. 203. (d).

Humanity, state in xiii cent. i. 634.

Hungarians, reformation, ii. 216.

Hungary, Christianity established in x cent. i. 434. claims of different nations, 435. and (n).

Huss, John, commotions by, in xv cent. cent. i. 772. and (p), reasons for clergy's resentment against, 773. other incidents in Prague raise him enemies, *ib.* publicly recommends Wickliff's opinions, 774. and (u), condemned, and burnt alive, with the true causes of such proceedings, 775. and (x), 776. his inflexible obstinacy exposes him to condemnation, 777.

Hussinet, Nicholas, head of the Hussites, i. 794.

Hussites, war in Bohemia in xv cent. i. 794. shocking cruelties on both sides, 795. two factions among them, 795.

Hyrcania, the gospel preached there, in viii. cent. i. 337. and (a).

I.

Jamblichus, of Chalcis, successors, i. 179. and (b).

Jasidians, Jezdæans, ii. 139. opinion about the evil genius, and whence so called, 140. (e).

Images, controversy about their worship in viii cent. detrimental to the empire, i. 343. origin of dispute about them under Philippicus Bardanes, 368. progress under Leo the Isaurian, 369. and (r), contests of the partisans for and against, 370. effects of image-worship, *ib.* and (s), progress of disputes about them under Constantine Copronymus, 371. and (t), under Leo IV. and under Irene, 372. four books, answered by pope Adrian, *ib.* controversy among the Greeks on this subject in ix cent. 410. among the Latins in ix cent. 411. middle opinion between Idolaters and Iconoclasts, *ib.* use in churches allowed by a council at Paris, but not to be worship'd, 412. this injunction gradually departed from, and several Iconoclasts in this cent. 412. controversy about their sanctity in xi cent. and decisions, 533.

James bishop of Edessa translates Aristotle's dialectics into Syriac, i. 320.

James I. of England, declaration in an assembly at Edinburgh, ii. 492. and (d), the part he took in the conference at Hampton-court, *ib.* (e), with the adulation of Whitgift and Bancroft, *ib.* in *fin.* things change under him, with his continual shifting opinions, 493. Abbot endeavours to confirm him in Calvinism, with that prince's dislike of the Dort proceedings, and reasons, 494. and *sub* (h) and (i), fatal to the Puritans, and dies, 495.

James II. ii. 347. why obliged to abdicate, when the Revolution under William prince of Orange took place, *ib.*

Jansenism, rise and contests, ii. 393. Jansenius's book, *ib.* (g) and (h), combated by the Jesuits, who procure its condemnation at Rome, ii. 394. this opposed by the doctors of Louvain and other Augustinians, also in France by the abbot of St. Cyran, *ib.* and (k), and (l), French theologists mostly favour the Jesuits, with the respectable patrons of Jansenius, 395. both parties how balanced, *ib.* and (m), methods and arguments employed by each, and miracles pretended by the Jansenists, 396. and (n), reflections on, *ib.* in *fin.*

Jansenists, austere piety, and other causes of disgust to the Jesuits, ii. 401. complaints against the church of Rome, and justness of their general principles, but the consequences and application faulty, 402. and (a), exemplified in Verger, abbot of St. Cyran, their great oracle, *ib.* *sub not.* why denominated Rigorists, 403. notion of repentance, exemplified in the Abbé de Paris, 404. in the female convent of Port-Royal, *ib.* and (e), pious persons ambitious to dwell in huts near it, 405. end in view, and vicissitudes in this convent, 406. till demolished by Lewis XIV. *ib.*

Jansenius, five propositions of his book condemn'd by pope Innocent X. ii. 397. doctrines contained in them, 398. (o) and (p), distinction invented by Arnaud in favour of these propositions, *ib.* bull of Alexander VII. published against him, with

with a form of declaration sent into France, *ib.* divisions and tumults occasioned by it, 399. persecution of the Jansenists thro' the Jesuits, but suspended under Clement IX. and how, with those who opposed the declaration, 400. conditional subscription obtained, and the effects on the Jansenists in the peace of Clement, *ib.* and (*u*), totally abolished by Lewis XIV. with the consequences, *ib.*

Japan, state of Christianity, ii. 300. success owing to two circumstances, and another besides, *ib.* (*a*), prejudices of the natives, and divisions among the missionaries, 301. accusations against the Jesuits by the other missionaries, with the charge against the latter by the Jesuits, *ib.* downfall and extirpation how effected, with the reasons, 302. firmness of the converts and missionaries under horrid torments, with the causes of this persecution, *ib.* and (*c*), except a few Dutch, 303.

Iconoclastæ, (*Iconomachi*) i. 370.

Iconoduli (*Iconolatræ*) i. 370.

Ideas, universal, question about, in xth cent. i. 444. and (*k*).

Idolatry, further decline under Theodius the younger, i. 229.

Jerusalem, first Christian church, and constitution, i. 25. not immutable, 44.

Jesuitas, Nestorian pontif, his treaty with Mahomet and Omar, i. 330. the former's testamentary diploma to the Christians, with the arguments for and against its authenticity, *ib.* (*k*).

Jesuits, their institution, diminish the credit of the clerks schools in xv cent. i. 790. zeal in submitting to the pope, and true motives in their missions, ii. 76. new order in xiv cent. 102. Lessius and Hamelius, contests with them, 122. nature of their order and institution, 94. three classes, with one more, *ib.* (*x*), vows and secrets of their society, to whom only entrusted, 95. zeal for the popes interests, and insinuating manners, with the perils to which exposed, and how extricated, 96. character by Dr. Brown of Dublin, *ib.* (*a*), doctrine about the motives to moral actions, 117. about probability, 118. and (*a*), philosophical

sin, and effects of these debates, *ib.* *sub not.* multitude of their adversaries, particularly the Jansenists, 377. and (*k*), history by Benard, *ib.* *sub not.* interest strengthened by opposition, 378. and (*l*), ill looked upon, 286. are more or less feared, even by the popes, 287. methods of converting, procure enemies, and the contrary conduct of other missionaries, 288. in China accused of male-practices, 294. partly acknowledged, but coloured over, 296. principal charge against them, 296.

Jesus, fathers of the oratory founded in xvii cent. ii. 375. institute, *ib.* and (*a*), extend their original plan, 376.

Jewish rites retained in several places, i. 58.

Jews, corrupt God's worship by rites from the Gentiles, i. 17. various causes of their corruption, *ib.* and 18. some remains of piety to be found, and their state out of Palestine evinces providence, 19. their calamities under the Romans, 13. multiplied by their own rulers, with a character of these and the lower people, and their religion much corrupted, *ib.* their civil and religious state under Herod, at Christ's birth, 12. after Herod's death, *ib.* their principal sects and points of debate, 14. and (*l*), yet shewed mutual toleration, and its motives, 15. bitter enemies against the Christians in Palestine, 28. plausible pretexts for this procedure, and severely punished, *ib.* philosophy among them, 40. their sedition and slaughter under Barcocheba, serviceable to Christianity, 75. occasion dissensions in ii cent. 106. their attempts against the Christians in iii cent. 131. attempt to rebuild their temple, 173. the miraculous phænomena, and disputes on that head, *ib.* and (*b*), many converted in vi cent. and to what owing, 281. compelled in vii cent. to embrace Christianity, 313. writers against them in ix cent. 409. converted thro' force in xiv cent. 713.

Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, his epistles, i. 51. that to Polycarp very doubtful, 52. exposed by Trajan to wild beasts, 77.

Ignatius Loyola, dexterity in founding his order, ii. 76. (*b*).

Ildefonse,

Ildefonse, archbishop of Toledo, his character, i. 323. account of his treatise *De cognitione baptismi*, 326. hence it appears several doctrines now in the Romish church were not then invented, *ib.* (a).

Impanation, (consubstantiation) ii. 200. and (q).

Independants, in xvii cent. ii. 497. and (p), Rapin's account of them, examined and corrected, 498. *sub not.* whether chargeable with K. Charles I's death, 499. *sub not.* critique on their character, *ib.* * why so called, 500. and (q), and afterwards congregational brethren, 501. *sub not.* (q), difference from the Presbyterians, and how more commendable than the Brownists, *ib.* in xvii cent. origin and progress, 502. union with the Presbyterians in ix articles, *ib.* and (s).

India, Christianity propagated there, ii. 288.

Indulgences, bishops begun the traffic of them in xii cent. i. 594. monopolized by the popes, 595. lengths to which brought, and supererogation invented to justify them, 596. this doctrine refuted, *ib.* (a).

Innocent III. pope, his works, i. 591. introduces transubstantiation and auricular confession, 683.

Innocent VI. pope, his character, i. 727.

Innocent X. pope, (Pamfili) his vile character, ii. 336. his commerce with Donna Olympia, *ib.* (e).

Innocent XI. (Odeschalchi) his high character, ii. 337. and (i).

Innocent XII. (Pignatelli) his high character, ii. 338.

Inquisition, its rise in Narbonne Gaul, i. 696. the first delegates for this purpose, and form settled, 697. and (g), on what plan, 698. rights granted, 699. treatment from the public, and severer methods used against hereticks, 700. fruitless opposition of the earl of Tholouse against the pope, with the issue, 701. its severity in xiv cent. towards the Beghards, 755.

Interim, edict so called, ii. 62. and (a), troubles hence, 63. Melancthon's opinion about it, and things indifferent, 64. (b), produces new divisions, *ib.*

Interpreters, ancient, of scripture, their defects, i. 92.

Investitures, tumults in xi cent. thro' the law about them, i. 505. and (u), custom by the ring and crosier, 506. methods to elude the princes right, and theirs to retain it, 507. origin of this custom, 508. what offended the pontifs, 509, 510. war thereon, 511. revolt by Randolph against the emperor Henry, with the latter's poor behaviour at Canusium, 512. Rodolph chosen emperor, and the terrible war thereon, till the pope's death, 513. tumults and divisions continue under Urban II. 514. dispute about them fomented in ii cent. 572. progress, 573. peace between the emperor and the pope, the latter of which breaks it, and dies, 574. healing measures of Calixtus II. and this long contest to what owing, 575. peace concluded, and the terms, 576. two popes raised at the same time, and the succession of them from the death of Innocent III. to the end of this cent. 577. contest between Barbarossa and Adrian IV. and, on the latter's death, a dispute in electing a new pope, 578. after various successs, the emperor concludes a peace, 579. misunderstanding between pope Alexander III. and Henry II. of England, on Becket's account, and the latter assassinated, 581, 582. (t).

Joachim, Franciscan abbot, his predictions, i. 664. and (s), Gerhard's explication condemned, and an account of that piece, 665. and (w).

Joachim, abbot of Flora, i. 680. and (c), his heresy about the Trinity, 710.

Joan, pope, in ix cent. i. 391. contest about the truth of this story, and a middle course held, 392. (r) (s) and (t).

John the forerunner of the Messiah, i. 20. his character and success, 21.

John, bishop of Jerusalem, a partizan of Origen, i. 204.

John of Jerusalem, knights of, i. 559. origin, valour, and division into three classes, 560.

John, the Sophist, and his disciples, in xi cent. i. 485. (s) and (t).

John, surnamed Pungens Afinus, his notion of the Eucharist, i. 691.

John X. pope, his infamous election in x cent.

cent. and fate, i. 447.—xi and xii. 448. the latter's fate, 449.—xiii. *ib.*—xiv and xv. 450.

John XV. enrolls the first faint in x cent. i. 459.

John XXII. his character, i. 724. i. 724. contest with Lewis of Bavaria, by whom he is deposed, 725. accused of heresy, *ib.* and (*p*), unanimous resolution of the Parisians thereon, 726.

John, elector of Saxony, acts differently from his brother Frederick, ii. 37. establishes a church in his dominions different from that of Rome, *ib.* settles its doctrine, discipline, and government, *ib.* his example followed in Germany, yet religious differences break out, *ib.*

Jonas, bishop of Orleans, a Christian moralist, i. 408.

Jordan, his new edition of the Latin Bible, i. 684.

Jovinian, opposes superstitions in iv cent. i. 203. banished, and Jerome's bitter treatise against him, 204.

Isbraniki, (*Roskolsnka*) sect in Russia, ii. 419. and (*m*), their tenets, 420. (*n*) and (*o*), effects of violent and mild measures for reclaiming them, *ib.*

Ithacius, bishop of Sossuba, first introduces civil persecution into the church, and infamous character, i. 225. and (*m*), reflexion on civil punishment of heretics, *ib.* Irenæus, his five books against heresies, 89. and (*o*), his work against heretics, lost, 93.

Irish, converted in v cent. i. 232.

Isidore, of Pelusium, i. 246. and (*i*) and (*k*), his Commentaries on the Scriptures, i. 250. and (*d*), censures allegorical interpreters, 251.

Jubilee, altered in xiv cent. i. 752.

Julia Mammæa, favourable to Christianity, i. 123.

Julianus Pomerius's mystic precepts collected, i. 254. his works, 324, 325, 327.

Julian, sole emperor, attempts to destroy Christianity, i. 171. apostacy, to what owing, 172. consummate dexterity, and ruinous projects, prevented by death, with his true character, *ib.* (*d*) and (*e*), opprobrious defects, 173. and (*f*), permits the Jews to rebuild their temple,

and state of the church after his death, 174.

Julius II. pope, his infamous character, ii. 5. miserable state of the church under him, 6. calls a Lateran council, but dies, *ib.* whence so called, 97. (*b*).

Julius III's character, 97. (*d*).

Justin Martyr, falls a victim, i. 79. his two Apologies, 89. his Exposition on the Revelations, lost, 92. why unsuccessful in his controversy with the Jews, 93. his writings on morality, 94. against heretics, lost, *ib.*

Juvenal, bishop of Ælia, his ambition, i. 240. confirmed by the Chalcedon council in his usurpations, 241. and (*q*).

K.

Kabbala, when first taught, i. 40.

Kang-hi, Chinese emperor, favoured the missionaries, ii. 294. and (*s*).

Karit, nation, embrace Christianity in x cent. i. 432.

Kempis, Thomas, his works, i. 793. and (*u*), 799.

Kilian, St. his success in the gospel, i. 32.

Knighthood, military orders, and use, i. 559.

Knox, John, character, ii. 68. and (*g*), animated the Scots to a total extirpation of Popery, 69. this spirit how modified in other countries, *ib.* (*k*), departed not altogether from the ancient form, and how, *ib.* in fine.

Knutzen, his impiety, ii. 316.

L.

Labbadie, John, ii. 555. and (*b*), his singular opinions, 556. (*d*), austere sanctity, and treatises, *ib.* and (*e*).

Labadists, sect in xviii cent. ii. 555. founder, and migrations of that community, *ib.* (*b*) and (*c*).

Lactantius, account of his life, (*g*) and (*h*).

Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, i. 483. and (*w*), his commentary, 527. introduces logic into theology, 528. his candor, *ib.* (*c*).

Langton, Stephen, archbishop, i. 680. and (*d*), 684.

Languages, oriental, studied in xiii cent. i. 63.

- i. 635. their state in xiv cent. i. 717. improvement in xvii cent. ii. 323. the advantages to religion, *ib.*
- Latins*, state of philosophy among them in x cent. i. 444. controversy about the Lord's supper in xii cent. i. 606. complaints of infidelity and atheism in xiii cent. and the causes, 629. and (a), contest among them in xv cent. about the worship due to Christ's blood, and the issue, 801. rites increased among them in xv cent. 802. instances by popes, *ib.*
- Latitudinarians*, pacific sons in xvii cent. ii. 505. chief leader, 506. and (d), treatment and present state, *ib.*
- Laud*, archbishop, his character, ii. 346. and (i), executes the plans of his master Charles I. 495. violent proceedings, 496. odium hereupon brings him to the scaffold, *ib.*
- Law*, Roman, its study renewed in xii cent. i. 567. happy event, and opinion about substituting it in the place of all others, 568. and (i),—canon advanced to the same privilege, *ib.* civil and canon studied in xiii cent. 638.
- Leadley*, Jane, founder of the Philadelphian society in xvii cent. and her followers, ii. 588.
- Learning*, see *Letters*, its restoration in xvi cent. why not alarming to the pontiffs, ii. 5.
- Lebuin*, of England, preaches, and where, in viii cent. i. 339.
- Leenhof*, Frederick van, account of his Heaven upon Earth, and tenets in xviii cent. ii. 577.
- Legion*, thundering, account of its miracles, i. 74. the certain and doubtful parts, 75. and (n).
- Leo*, the philosopher, promotes learning in x cent. i. 441.
- Leo I.* the Great, vigorous asserter of the power of the Roman see, yet meets with invincible obstacles, i. 244. his character, 246. and (o), his legates preside in the council of Chalcedon, and famous epistle received there, i. 270. and (e).
- Leo*, the Wise, account of, i. 384.
- Leo*, the Grammarian, account of, i. 478.
- Leo X.* pope, his mixt character, ii. 6. care in preventing any Reformation by the Lutheran council, 7. gets the Pragmatic Sanction abrogated, and Concordate substituted, with the state of that matter, *ib.* and (b). issues a bull against Luther through Eckius's fury, ii. 27, 28. his death, 33.
- Lefzynski*, account of him and his fate for impiety, ii. 316. and (o).
- Letters*, their state in ii cent. more specious than solid fall into contempt, i. 81. their decay, different reasons for it, 132. their state in iv cent. 179. their state in the West in vi cent. 285. among the bishops and monks, and that pernicious to piety, by Gregory the Great, 286. and (d), arts and sciences imperfectly taught, and study of philosophy decried, *ib.* their state among the Greeks in vi cent. *ib.* on Justinian's edict against Athens, the modern Platonists retire to Persia, who never recover their credit, 287. hence Aristotle's philosophy illustrated by Philoponus, and many others in the East, though some of them invent systems quite absurd, 288. their state in vii cent. 318. their state among the Greeks in viii cent. 345. their state among the Arabians in ix cent. 384. their state among the Greeks in ix cent. *ib.* in Europe in ix cent. *ib.* indebted to the Arabians, 385. state under Charlemagne, and his successors, *ib.* impediments to their progress in ix cent. 386. several examples of learned men, 387. their state among the Greeks in x cent. 441. in the Western provinces, 443. and (b), their state among the Saracens in x cent. 442. their state among the Greeks in xi cent. 478. in the West, 479. schools opened, 480. sciences taught there, 481. and (l), their state among the Greeks in xii cent. favourable, and to what owing, 564. their state among the Latins in xii cent. 565. schools and universities, with their signal advantages, and new division of the sciences, 566. hence four faculties, 567. their state among the Greeks in xiii cent. 631. their progress in the West in xiii cent. 632. their

- their state among the Latins in xiv cent. 716. their state among the Greeks in xiv cent. *ib.* their state among the Latins in xv cent. 764. encouraged by several princes, and what branches cultivated, 765. their sad state in xvi cent. to what owing, ii. 12. the public advantages of their restoration to Christianity, 79. their state in xvi cent. and surprising variety in the style of writers, 104.
- Leuthard*, troubles through him in x cent. i. 464. his fate, and disciples, *ib.*
- Libertines*, spiritual, their tenets, ii. 228. also the Libertines of Geneva, *ib.*
- Licinius*, persecutes the Christians in iv cent. i. 170. turbulence, defeat, and death, *ib.* this persecution, mentioned by Aurelius Victor, by the learned is overlooked, *ib.* and (*b*).
- Lisle*, Alain de, i. 634. and (*l*), his character, 680. and (*e*), his book against Jews and Pagans, 690.
- Lithuanians* converted in xiii cent. by the Teutonic knights, i. 627. their conversion in xiv cent. 713.
- Livonians*, converted by arms in xii cent. i. 552.
- Logic*, Dialectics, in high repute in xi cent. i. 482. the most eminent Logicians, *ib.*
- Logicians*, disputes among them, in xi cent. i. 484. Realists and Nominalists, *ib.* and (*q*).
- Lollards*, account of them, i. 744. by whom favoured, and persecuted, 746.
- Lombard*, Peter, his works, i. 592. master of the sentences, 597, 598. and (*g*), which were in greater repute than the Bible, 600. and (*l*).
- Logius*, Martin, his chimerical notion, i. 796. he and his followers cause the barbarities by the Hussites, *ib.*
- Lord's Supper*, its celebration and ceremonies in ii cent. i. 105.
- Lothaire's* endeavours to revive learning in Italy with little success, i. 386.
- Love*, family of, founded by Henry Nicholas, ii. 257.
- Low-churchmen*, in xvii cent. ii. 508. and (*k*), see *Dodwell*.
- Loyola*, Ignatius, founder of the Jesuits, ii. 93. and (*t*), account of him, and his life, *ib.* and (*u*), want of learning and genius, 94. and (*w*), his assistance, *ib.* in *fine*.
- Lubieniecius*, Stanislaus, his character, and failure in establishment of the Socinians outed from Poland, ii. 551. where dispersed, and tenets in which all agree, 552. and (*u*), yet vary, *ib.* *sub not.* and *.
- Lucar*, Cyrillus, opposition to the Latins in xvii cent. ii. 417. how put to death, and religious tenets, *ib.* and (*e*).
- Lucas*, follower of Spinoza and his works, ii. 319.
- Lully*, Raymund, his character, i. 719. fate, and different opinions about it, 720.
- Luther*, Martin, begins the Reformation in xvi cent. ii. 15. his high character, 16. exasperated at Tetzels preaching indulgences, opposes him, and vindicated from selfish views, 17. (*p*), true state of the debate between him and Tetzels, 18. his sentiments applauded and abhorred, 19. his adversaries objections he strongly refutes, yet declares his readiness to change on fair conviction, *ib.* conference between him and Cajetan at Augsburg, with the pope's imprudence, and issue, why ineffectual, 20. and (*r*), on pope Leo X's violence he appeals to a general council, *ib.* Miltitz appointed legate, his successful transactions, and great character, 21. these hopes how blasted, and Cajetan's absurd expressions, *ib.* Miltitz's conferences of different nature, 22. legate's reproaches against Tetzels who dies of grief, *ib.* and (*y*), four things required of Luther, with his submissive letter to the pope, *ib.* and (*z*), agrees to write a circular letter to his disciples, and further declaration, 23. by Rome's not accepting his submission, the divisions widened, and conferences with Miltitz, and the latter's unhappy fate, *ib.* and (*a*), dispute between Eckius and Carlostadt renders these ineffectual, with its nature, and another between the former and Luther, 24. (*c*) and (*e*), Eckius breathes fury against

against Luther, which contributes to the Reformation, and Melancthon espouses his cause, 25. the pope's bull against him, renews the appeal and withdraws publicly from the Romish communion, 28. burns it with the canons for the papal supremacy, and is excommunicated, 29. rise of the church founded by him, and seconded by learned men, with the effects for a Reformation, *ib.* called before the diet at Worms, his noble resolution, with the result, and banishment, 30. excessive severity of his sentence, *ib.* and (*r*), why without effect, 31. *sub* (*r*), saved by Frederick of Saxony in Wartenberg-castle, *ib.* and (*s*), intrepidity at his friends remonstrances, with his moderation and humility, *ib.* *sub not.* his conduct after leaving Wartenberg, and the motives of quitting it, 32. and (*t*), German translation of the Bible, *ib.* and (*u*), why excommunicated by the pope through Eckius, 28. his opinion about the real presence, and miserable comparison explaining it, 34. and (*z*), his obstinacy, and hot controversy, 35. draws up XVII articles of faith, called those of Torgaw, and enlarged by Melancthon, 42.—dies, 60. catechism adopted by all his followers, 150. explications of scripture, 159. golden rule of interpretation, *ib.* and (*a*).

M.

Macarius, elder and younger, i. 188. his character as a moralist, 196. his enormous error 388. refuted by Ratram, *ib.* and (*c*).

Maccavius introduces subtilties into theology, ii. 226. and (*n*), followed by others, *ib.*

Macedonius, his heresy, i. 224. crushed by the council of Constantinople, which fixed the notion of Three Persons in One God, &c. *ib.*

Madury, account of that successful mission and its author, ii. 288. the singular method used, *ib.* that kingdom described, 290. *sub* (*m*), this and the like missions, why suspended by the pope, *ib.*

Magnus, Albertus, i. 685. commentary, 688.

Magus, Simon, account of him, i. 66. his doctrines, 67.

Mahomet appears in vii cent. i. 313. his character, *ib.* (*m*) and (*n*), his public declarations about religion, 314. he delivers the law called Koran, *ib.* and (*o*), forms a project of founding an empire, and what judgment to form of him, *ib.* causes of the rapid progress of his religion, 315. treatment to the Christians from his followers, 316. the division of the Mahometans into two sects, and others subordinate, 317.

Mahomet's Testament in favour of the Christians, i. 330. and (*k*), arguments for and against its authenticity, *ib.* his successors in Persia employed the Nestorians in weighty affairs, 331.

Maieul, St. regular Clerks, by whom founded, and their occupation, ii. 302.

Major, Gregory, controversy on the necessity of good works, with Amstdorf, ii. 172.

Manes, Manichæus, account of him, i. 152. various relations about his death, *ib.* and (*e*), his doctrine of two principles, and summary concerning Man, Christ, and the Holy Ghost, 153. Christ's Office and the Comforter, 154. purification of souls and future state, with the fate of unpurified souls, and opinion concerning Old and New Testament, 155. rule of life austere, and divides his disciples into two classes, *ib.*

Manichæans, general assembly, president, &c. i. 156. prevalent in vi cent. 304. where in xv cent. 803.

Marcellinus sent to Africa about the Donatists, determines for the Catholics, i. 260. whether this was a conference or a judicial trial, *ib.* and (*e*), the consequences, and relief to the Donatists from Genseric invading Africa, *ib.*

Marcellus, of Ancyra, his tenets about the Trinity, i. 223. and (*e*).

Marchia, Jacob à, his opinion about the worship due to Christ's blood, i. 801.

Marcion, account of him and his tenets, i. 109. his followers, 110.

Mardaites,

Mardaites, see *Maronites*.

Margaret, of Navarre, favourable to the Reformation in France, ii. 48. many persons of rank averse to Rome, and put to death, with contradictory conduct of Francis I. towards the Protestants, and the reasons, *ib.* and (z).

Maronites, from whom so called, i. 335. and (s), retained the Monothelite opinions till xii cent. and the endeavours of their learned to deny this accusation vain, *ib.* and (t), their subjection to Rome, ii. 144. and (x), their condition, 145. expence to the popes, *ib.*

Marpurg, conference between the Reformers ineffectual, ii. 41. who these were, and the advantage therefrom, *ib.*

Martial, controversy about the bishop in xi cent. i. 540. the pope's decision about his apostleship, 541.

Martin, bishop of Tours, converts the Gauls, i. 177. erects the first monasteries in Gaul, whence their discipline spreads, 198. dialogue from Sulpitius of an Eastern and Western monk, with the difference, in austerity, between them, *ib.* and (s).

Martin, Raymond, character of his *Pugio Fidei*, i. 635.—681.—690.

Martyrs, whence so called, i. 32. veneration paid them perverted, and their number, 33. lives, and why recorded, *ib.* and how lost and retrieved, *ib.*

Mary, queen, restores popery, ii. 67. takes off archbishop Cranmer, 68.

Mary, the office of that Holy Virgin instituted in x cent. i. 462.

Mary, Virgin, controversy about immaculate conception in xvii cent. ii. 406. pope's declarations to both parties, and festival appointed, 407. and (g).

Mathematics, their improvement in xvii cent. ii. 320.

Matthias, how chosen an apostle, i. 25.

Maty, Paul, hypothesis about the Trinity in xviii cent. ii. 578. the propositions it contains, *ib.* and (f).

Maur, St. its congregation, ii. 372. select number of learned members, and their adversaries, 373. and (x), many and admirable productions, *ib.* and (y), their reformation falls short of the perfection of austerity which filled the ima-

ginations of some, 374. this severe plan adopted by the Jansenists, *ib.* and (z), by Bouthillier de Rance, and the remarkable occasion, *ib.* and (b), his order de la Trappe gradually degenerates, 375.

Maurice, of Hesse, from Lutheran becomes Calvinist in xvii cent. with the change thereon in his dominions, ii. 427.

Maximin, persecution under that emperor, i. 126.

Maxims, two, pernicious, universal in iv cent. i. 200. the greatest men infected with the first; and the second, introduced on Constantine's accession, adapted in the following ages, *ib.*

Maximus, Julian's master, why put to death, i. 180.

Maximus, the Greek monk, account of him and his works, i. 322, 325, 326.

Mazen, Nicholas de, his zeal in reforming the monks of Germany in xv cent. i. 787.

Meier, account of that follower of Spinoza, and works, 318. and (w).

Melancthon, Philip, his great character, ii. 25. timorous and yielding, with the effects, *ib.* his character 155. writings in philosophy, and of what sect, *ib.* compared with Luther, 169. and (p), different sentiments from the latter, 176. (p) and (r), his explanations on the scriptures, 159. his *Loci Communes*, 160. desire for Union between the Reformed and Lutherans, 193. facilitated by Calvin, *ib.* and (g), obstacles, 194.

Meletian controversy, and the reasons alleged, i. 201.

Melito, bishop of Sardis, his treatises, i. 93, gives the first catalogue of the books of the Old Testament, *ib.* and (t).

Mendicants, instituted in xiii cent. i. 654. history of this order, 655. reduced to four, and highly regarded by the public, 656. unhappy dissensions between them and the bishops, 659. in high esteem in xiv cent. 730. fall into general odium, *ib.* their pride in xiii cent. with the causes, 661. a specimen of their frauds, *ib.* and (g), contests between the Dominicans and Franciscans, 662. their irregularities in xv cent. 187. complaints.

- plaints against them, and the causes of increasing the odium against them, 788.
- Menno*, account of, ii. 241. his travels and success in making proselytes to the Anabaptists, and his writings, 242. and (1), his doctrine and discipline, *ib.* imprudent conduct towards two sects that arose, 245.
- Mennonites*, see *Anabaptists*, their various fortunes in xvii cent. 544. severities against them, *ib.* and (e), concord restored, 545. different sects, with subdivisions, and tenets of the Refined, *ib.* external form of church in three distinct orders, 546.
- Methodists*, Popish, two classes in France, ii. 535. the most eminent among the first, and those of the second class, 354. (g) and (h), Bossuet among the latter, with the character of his history, 355. instance retorted with truth upon himself, *ib.* *sub not.*
- Methodius*, his character, i. 139.—398. his explication of Genesis and Solomon's Song lost, 143. his Panegyric on Dionysius, 408.
- Methodius* and Cyril, two monks, convert the Moesians in ix cent. i. 379. and (b).
- Metropolitans*, whether any in i cent. i. 48. whence their rights, 88. who, 182.
- Michael*, St. superstition about him in x cent. i. 464.
- Micislaus*, the first Christian Duke of Poland, i. 433.
- Millennium*, controversy about it in iii cent. i. 145. opposed by Origen, and supported by Nepos, 146. stopped by Dionysius, *ib.*
- Mingrelian's* sad state, ii. 132.
- Ministry*, necessity of a public one, i. 42.
- Minucius*, Felix, character of his dialogue, i. 139.
- Miracles*, &c. serviceable to Christianity, i. 74. of the Thundering Legion, *ib.* of iv cent. given up, tho' not ceased then, 178. in Africa, on Trinitarians, under the Vandal persecution in v cent. and the credible witnesses of them, 261. and (b), dispute among the learned about it, and reflexion thereon, *ib.* *sub not.* in vi cent. invalidated by the converts lives, 281.
- Misa*, Jacobell, a disciple of Huss, i. 794. gives infants a right to the Eucharist, 796.
- Missionaries*, account of their hardships not to be too readily received, ii. 290.
- Molina*, Lewis, character of him and his writings, ii. 123. (i) (k) and (l).
- Molinists*, controversies with them, ii. 123.
- Molinos*, see *Quietism*, account of his books published, ii. 107. and (b), substance of his principles, and followers why called Quietists and Mystics, 408. by whom opposed, recants, and condemned to perpetual imprisonment, *ib.* injustice of his enemies, and charge on his real system, *ib.* followers, and methods for suppressing their progress, 409.
- Monastic* life in high repute in ix cent. i. 396. many employed in civil affairs, with reformation attempted, 397.
- Monkery* passes from the East to the West, i. 198. where first, *ib.* and (q).
- Monkish* societies in iv cent. i. 97.
- Monks*, whence sprung, i. 86. and hermits, whence their rise, 141. different orders, 199. first laity, then clergy, *ib.* in v cent. claim an eminence in the church, 245. observe different discipline, *ib.* and (f), their growth in vi cent. 291. how exempted from episcopal jurisdiction, 322. fruitful source of disorder, and their state among the Latins in vii cent. with those who laid down rules, *ib.* their discipline fallen into decay in viii cent. 358. the effects to stop it ineffectual, *ib.* learning in x cent and writers, 444. their discipline declines to nothing in x cent. 453. state of their orders in the xi cent. 515. exempted by the popes from the authority of their sovereigns, and jurisdiction of their bishops, 516. great corruption gives occasion to institutions of chivalry, *ib.* and (u), opulence and credit increased, 517. new orders in xi cent. founded, 519. great austerity, and two classes, 520. how distinguished, *ib.* and (f), new orders in xii cent.

- xii cent. 587. new orders in xiii cent. 652. reasons for encouraging them, and several suppressed, 653. those still subsisting, *ib.* high esteem in xiv cent. 730. infamous in xv cent. 787. corrupt state of their order in xvi cent. ii. 9. averse to learning, *ib.* of great service to the popes, 93. much reformed, 100. new orders in xvi cent. 102.
- Monophysites*, their state in xvii cent. ii. 422. and (s)—African and Abyssinian oppose the missionaries, *ib.*
- Monothelites*, account of them, and Heraclius's compromise, i. 331. progress of their doctrine, 332. opposition by Sophronius, *ib.* account of their doctrine, 334. different opinions among them, and the only point of controversy, with the danger of religious peace founded on ambiguous doctrines, 335. after the council of Constantinople, their doctrine received among the Maronites, *ib.*
- Montanus*, his tenets, and some mistakes about them, i. 119. and (b), his excessive austerity, 120. reasons for excommunicating him, and success of his doctrine, which Tertullian adopts, 121. and (c).
- Montesone*, John de, his contest about the conception, and issue, i. 752.
- Moors* banished Spain in xviii cent. ii. 354.
- Moralists*, see *Writers*, of Christianity in ii cent. i. 94. their merit as such, 95. and (a), their double doctrine, *ib.* divide this rule into precepts and counsels, 96. hence the Ascetics, *ib.* in iv cent. 195. their defects, 196. in v cent. 253. want of method, and tracing their subject to its principles, *ib.* their enthusiastic inventions, *ib.* and public instructors, their further defects, 255. exemplified in Salvian's opinion, *ib.*
- Moralists*, Christian, in ix cent. i. 408.
- Morality*, Christian, in xiii cent. i. 688. important remark about manner of treating, exemplified, 689.
- Morality*, Romish, its state in xvi cent. ii. 112. no attempts to improve it, and complaints against the Jesuits, *ib.* three classes of writers on it, 113.
- Morals*, in viii cent. i. 363. in x cent. 460.
- Moses Barcephas*, his great character, i. 399.
- Moyer*, Lady, her lectures founded in xviii cent. ii. 579.
- Muhlberg*, elector of Saxony entirely defeated there, and taken prisoner, ii. 61.
- Munzer*, heading the peasants in xvi cent. makes a religious war, ii. 36. his ravages not chargeable on Luther, is defeated, taken, and put to death, *ib.* fate of his associates, 237.
- Muscovy*, Christianity established there in x cent. i. 433.
- Mysticism*, its progress in ix cent. i. 408.
- Mystics*, whence, i. 86. unfair defence, 145. multiplied in iv cent. 193. number in iv cent. and doctrine propagated, 196. in v cent. extreme rigor and madness, 254. whence derived, 298. in xiv cent. 750. the only sparks of piety among them in xvi cent. ii. 15. but incapable of combating the errors of the times, *ib.*

N.

- Nagel*, Paul, his reveries in xvii cent. ii. 470.
- Nantes*, edict, to Protestants, and their privileges, ii. 203.
- Naples*, commotions there, ii. 72. the true cause of them, 73. (t).
- Nations*, state of those not under the Romans, i. 3. their abominable superstitions, and all different, *ib.*
- Nature*, its law, studied with attention in xvii cent. ii. 323. Grotius led the way, with the advantages to Christian morality, *ib.* and 324.
- Nazarenes*, account of them, i. 70. 106. reckoned heretics by Epiphanius, *ib.* (d), their gospel, *ib.* and (e), that term what originally, 107. their tenets, and why gently treated by most Christians, *ib.*
- Neri*, St. Philip, founds priests of the oratory, ii. 103. by whom assisted, 104. (y).
- Nero*, why he persecuted the Christians, i. and (t).
- Nestorianism*, its rise and author, i. 263. occasion of this controversy, 264. its progress, after the council of Ephesus, in the East, 266.
- Nestorians*, their divisions cease, and doctrine what, 268. veneration for their founder, and Barsumas's improvements, *ib.*

- ib.* Eastern, explored the true sense of scripture, 296. their state in vi cent. 306. state in vii cent. under the Saracens, 330. endeavours of popes in xiii cent. for accommodation with them fruitless, 695. two factions among them, and how occasioned, ii. 91. violent methods used by Menezes bishop of Goa, &c. to make them submit to Rome, *ib.* Chaldeans, 133. peculiar doctrines and rites, 136. careful in avoiding superstitious opinions and practices, 137. their patriarchs, *ib.* their state in xvii cent. 424. offers of reconciliation with Rome, why not accepted, 425. persecuted by the Romanists, and tolerated by the Dutch, 426.
- Nestorius* anathematizes Cyril of Alexandria twelve times, i. 264. faults in the course of his controversy, 266. and (*r*).
- Newton*, Sir Isaac, his character, ii. 332. and (*s*), excellence of his philosophy, how proved, 333.
- Nice*, first general council, i. 181. account of it from antient writers lame, 217. Arius condemned, and the time fixed for keeping Easter, 218. the Novatian troubles composed, and the Meletian schism condemned, &c. *ib.* (*s*), (*t*), (*u*), second council, its decision for images own'd by the Romans, 372.
- Nicetas Pectoratus*, account of, i. 524. chain of Commentaries on Job, 527. 604.
- Nicholas V.* pope, heals the schism in xv cent. and great character, i. 783, 784.
- Nicias's* books against the Gentiles, i. 327.
- Nicolaitans*, their tenets, i. 69.
- Nobili*, Robert de, account of that Jesuit's missionary, in 288. his singular stratagems in Madura, 289. and (*i*), followed by other Jesuits with surprizing success, and the causes, *ib.* and (*n*), and *.
- Noetus*, his account of the Trinity, i. 157. whence called Patripassians, *ib.*
- Nogaret*, William de, i. 721. seizure and mal-treatment of pope Boniface VIII. *ib.*
- Nogent*, Guibert, abbot of, i. 597. attacks the schoolmen, 600.
- Nominalists*, who, i. 388. and (*b*), old disputes with the Realists in xiv cent. 718.
- Non-conformists*, their state under Charles II. and James II. 507. toleration-act passed under K. William III. *ib.* and (*b*).
- Non jurors* (high-church-men) account of them in xvii cent. ii. 507. principles, 508.
- Norbert*, founds the order of Premontre in xii cent. i. 588. their excessive opulence and corruption, *ib.* (*q*), establishment in England, 589. (*r*).
- Normans*, their cruel ravages in ix cent. i. 382. piracy esteemed among them, *ib.* (*k*), form new settlements, *ib.*
- Norway*, Christianity established there in x cent. i. 436. whether by Olaus, Trygveson, or Suenon, 437. and (*u*).
- Novatian*, occasions sad divisions by his severity, i. 158. opposes Cornelius, chosen bishop of Rome, and separating, is excommunicated, but assisted by Novatus, and his severity against the lapsed, *ib.*
- Nuremberg*, proceedings in diet in xvi cent. ii. 33. peace between the Emperor and Protestants, with the terms, 54. the effects, 55.
- O.
- Oecam*, William, his character, i. 718, 719. keeness against the pope, 740. 747, 748.
- Ochinus Bernardin*, his opinions, ii. 230.
- Odoacer*, reduces Italy, but conquered by Theodoric, i. 228.
- Odenfee*, famous edict, ii. 46. and (*t*).
- Odilo*, of Cluni, adds All Souls to the festivals of x cent. i. 472. his works, 455. (*s*).
- Odo*, abbot of Clugni, his new discipline, i. 453. adopted every where, 454. his works, 455. his observations on Job, 460.
- Odo*, bishop of Cambray, i. 483. and (*p*), refutes the Jews, 603.
- Oecolampadius*, resumes the dispute on the Eucharist with Luther, ii. 191. and (*x*).
- Oeconomical* disputation, when introduced, i. 94. its nature, *ib.* (*y*), to what owing, 144. and (*l*).
- Oeconomical* council first established, i. 181.
- Olive*, Jean Pierre de, famous Franciscan in xiii cent. causes troubles in the order, i. 667. and (*b*), his main object and zeal, 668. and (*f*), these debates continued, till Matthew of Aqua Sparta is chosen general, 669. fresh tumults, and Celestine V. permits some of them to form an

- an order, *ib.* and (*i*), this annulled by Boniface VIII. and horribly persecuted, 670. and (*m*), these prepare the way for the Reformation, *ib.* *sub not.*
- Olympiodorus*, his history, i. 236. his chain on Job, 297. 454. 459.
- Ophites*, ridiculous heretics, Christian and Antichristian, i. 117. tenets whence they had their name, 118.
- Oratory*, priests of the, eminent for learning, ii. 103. why so called, 104.
- Order*, its meaning when applied to monks, i. 454. and (*b*).
- Orders*, ecclesiastical, vices in xii cent. i. 584. and (*d*).
- Orders*, new, founded in xiv cent. i. 743. new, in xv cent. 789.
- Orders*, monastic, their state in xvii cent. ii. 371. reforms made, and hence two classes, 372. new founded in xvii cent. 375.
- Oresme*, Nicholas, translation of Aristotle, i. 718.
- Origen*, his character, i. 138. and (*x*), his mistaken notion in handling religion by the Platonic philosophy, and the abuse of it by his disciples, 140. Hexapla, fragments, 141. and (*f*), unhappy method of interpreting Scripture allegorically, 142. and (*g*), in neglect of the letter, endeavours after the hidden sense, with his subdivisions of this, *ib.* and (*b*), other interpreters in the same strain, 143. Stromata and principles, *ib.* his moral works, *ib.* dispute about his doctrine, with the occasion, 147. rancour of Demetrius bishop of Alexandria, in two councils, against him, *ib.* his book of principles contains dangerous opinions, *ib.* and (*t*), his deprivation and degradation variously received, 148. and (*u*), controversies in iv cent. about him, 204. progress in the eastern and western provinces, with the consequences in the east, 205. controversies about him renewed in vi cent. 299. condemned by Justinian, 300. and (*k*) and (*l*), his doctrines condemned in the fifth general council at Constantinople, 301. and (*r*).
- Origenism*, disputes about it in v cent. i. 256. troubles of Chrysostom on that and other accounts, 257.
- Origenists*, who, i. 205.
- Orkneys*, Christianity first preached there in x cent. i. 437.
- Orosius*, his history, i. 234. his character, 247. and (*p*).
- Osfander*, disputes by him, ii. 176. his doctrine, 177.
- Ostrogoths*, kingdom in Italy, and duration, i. 229.
- Otho*, the Great, his zeal for Christianity in x cent. i. 437. mistaken notion, 438. unhappy effects, and plan of a holy war, *ib.*
- Otho*, bishop of Bamberg, converts the Pomeranians in xii cent. i. 550. and (*a*).
- P.
- Pachymeres*, George, his works, i. 679. his mystical works, i. 688.
- Padua*, Antony of, i. 684.
- Paganism*, remains of it, notwithstanding the zeal of the Christian emperors, i. 174. some remains in vi cent. even among the learned, 282.
- Pagans*, deities, antient heroes, &c. i. 5. material and heavenly bodies accounted for, *ib.* and (*m*), worship paid them, *ib.* had stated times and places, 6. infamous mysteries, *ib.* their religion had not the least influence towards virtue, and why rejected, *ib.* and promoted universal corruption, 7. two arguments of the crafty priests for it, *ib.*
- Pajon*, Claude, a reconciling doctor of the Reformed in xvii cent. ii. 489. this assertion corrected, *ib.* (*u*), sentiments misrepresented by his adversaries, 490. and (*y*), his own declaration, *ib.* and (*z*), his doctrine condemned, 491.
- Palæologus*, Jacob, burnt at Rome, ii. 280.
- Palamus*, Gregory, defends the Quietist monks in the xiv cent. against Barlaam, i. 754. over whom they triumph, *ib.* 755.
- Palatinate*, decline of Protestants in the xvii cent. ii. 477.
- Palestine*, its two religions much corrupted among the people at our Saviour's birth, i. 13. what sects among their learned, 14. affairs of the Christians decline in xii cent. 556.
- Palladius's* Lausiac history, i. 188. and (*e*), his mission among the Scots (Irish), i. 232.

232. and (q), his works and character, 246.
- Panormitanus*, Antonius, revives Latin poetry in xv cent. i. 766.
- Pantanus*, taught the Indians Christianity, i. 72. his version of the scriptures lost, 92.
- Papal* power saved from ruin, ii. 50.
- Papin*, Isaac, revives Pajon's controversy, who openly expresses his sentiments, ii. 491. refuted by Jurieu, and condemn'd, with excommunication, *ib.*
- Paracelsists*, eminent in xvi cent. ii. 157.
- Paracelsus*, his writings, ii. 81. and (q).
- Paris*, Matthew, his character, i. 634.
- Paris*, John, his high character, i. 681. and (n).
- Paris*, William of, i. 681.
- Parthenius*, patriarch of Constantinople, in xvii cent. opposes Rome, which desists from further attempts, ii. 418.
- Pasaginians* (circumcised), name of a sect in xii cent. unknown, i. 618. two distinguishing tenets, *ib.*
- Passau*, pacification with the Protestants, ii. 66. articles, *ib.* (d).
- Paterius*, Exposition of Old and New Testament, i. 325. and (y).
- Patropassians*, why so called, i. 118.
- Patriarchs*, creation whence, i. 182. bishop of Rome their prince, 88. in v cent. with their privileges, 241. not universally acknowledged, 242. inconveniences of this government, and quarrels among themselves, the source of sad discord, 243.
- Patrick*, Succathus, successful mission among the Irish, founds Armagh, and styled Apostle of the Irish.
- Paul*, called by Christ himself, i. 25. extraordinary character and success, *ib.* commentators in xvi cent. on his epistles, ii. 110.
- Paul*, the first hermit, i. 141.
- Paul*, of Samosata, his errors about the Trinity, i. 158.
- Paul*, the deacon, i. 362.
- Paul II.* pope, his mixt character, i. 785.
- Paul III.* contest about his character, ii. 97. (c).
- Paul IV.* his character, *ib.* (e).
- Paul V.* Borghese, his character, ii. 335. contest with Venice, and the occasion, *ib.* and (b), important pieces on both sides, 336. *sub* (b).
- Paulicians*, controversy of the Greeks with them in vii cent. i. 329. a sect in ix cent. 426. persecuted by the Greek emperors, with their dismal fate under Theodora, *ib.* entering into a league with the Saracens, they declare war against the Greeks, which becomes very bloody, 428. whether Manichæans, and their opinions in six articles, 429. and (x), in x cent. 363. Manichæans in xi cent. 543. in Europe, with the pains taken by the emperor Alexius to reclaim them, 544. where first settled, and different names, 545. (p), (q), and (r), first assembly at Orleans, with their abettors, a kind of mystics, 546. and (u), another branch converted by Gerhard, and particular tenets, 547. why adopted by some, 548.
- Paulinus*, bishop of Nola, account of, i. 190. and (n).
- Peasants*, their horrid war, and the occasion, in xvi cent. ii. 35. and (b), their claims made religious by Munzer, with their different demands, 36. abuses not chargeable on Luther's doctrine, *ib.*—defeated at Mulhausen, 36.
- Pelagian* controversy in v cent. i. 274. and (y).
- Pelagians*, their tenets, i. 275. and (a), sect suppressed by Augustin's writings, *ib.* progress of that controversy in the East, 276. brought to Rome, and its total suppression in Gaul and England in vii cent. 329. their opinions reckoned presumptuous, 278. yet several believed a natural power of perfect obedience to the divine law, *ib.*
- Pelagius*, account of him, 274. and (y), unjustly accused by Jerom, 275. and (z), Augustin's impartial testimony of him, *ib.*
- Penance*, its renewal in vii cent. i. 327.
- Penn*, William, grant from Charles II. of a large tract in America, ii. 536. and (t), flourishing state of that colony in Pennsylvania, *ib.*
- Penitents* allowed private confession by Leo the Great in v cent. i. 258.
- Pennafort*, Raymond, his Decretals, i. 639.
- Pennafort*,

- Pennafort*, Raymond, his polemic works, i. 689.
- People*, their rights in choosing rulers and teachers, i. 45. purchased by their oblations, *ib.*
- Perezius*, refutes the Jews in xv cent. i. 800.
- Perkins*, William, his practical writings, ii. 227. and (o).
- Persia*, three persecutions there by Sapor II. i. 178. and (a).
- Peter Fullo* (Fuller) rejects an opinion of Eutyches, which he modifies, and excites troubles in the church, i. 271.
- Peter*, the Chanter, i. 598. attacks the scholastics, 600.
- Petersen*, Jo. William, reveries in xvii cent. with his wife, ii. 462. and (s).
- Petrarch's* character, i. 717.
- Petrobrussians*, author of that sect, and their tenets in xii cent. i. 612.
- Peucer*, attempts a reformation in Lutheranism, substituting Calvin's tenets, ii. 179. character and sufferings, *ib.* (r), writings to promote his purposes, 180. and (t), convocations by Augustus at Dresden and Torgau, and issue, 181.
- Peyrere*, Isaac le, his strange doctrine in xvii cent. ii. 411. recants, and turns Papist, *ib.*
- Pharisees*, tenets, i. 14. moral doctrines, and bad influence, i. 16.
- Philadelphian* society, founder in xvii cent. ii. 558.
- Philip*, the Fair, opposes papal tyranny, with the event, i. 721.
- Philip*, of Hesse, unjustly detained prisoner by the emperor, ii. 61. the latter's mean perfidy and uncertainty on this point, 62. and (y).
- Philip*, father and son, emperors, favourable to the Christians, i. 123. whether Christians themselves, *ib.* and (d).
- Philology*, its flourishing state in xvi cent. ii. 78. importance, *ib.* and (m).
- Philosophers*, obscuring truth, i. 10. oriental, first principles, 37. divided in sentiments, 38. opinions concerning God, *ib.* origin of the world, 39. state and fate of human souls, 40. converted, whether of use to Christianity, 76. efforts in iv cent. against Christianity, 174. prejudice thereby received, 175. who these are, *ib.* who adopt neither metaphysical nor mathematical systems, ii. 333.
- Philosophy*, two kinds at Christ's birth, i. 8. appellations, 9. and (a) (b), state in the E. little known, 36. of the Magi or Persians, and followers, *ib.* of the Indians, *ib.* of the Egyptians, 37. oriental, proper, and first principles, *ib.* carried further, and how embarrassed, 38. its state in iii cent. 132. sad state in the W. 238. less so in the E. *ib.* Aristotle's rises into credit, 239. its fate in vii cent. 319. state in ix cent. 384. revival under Bardas, *ib.*
- Philostatus's* comparison of Christ with Apollonius Tyanæus, and pernicious consequences, i. 130.
- Philoxenus*, rejects Eutyches's opinion, and modifies it, i. 271.
- Philoxenus*, the Syrian, his translations, i. 296.
- Phocas*, engaged to give Boniface III. the title of Universal Bishop, i. 320.
- Photinus*, his sect and tenets, i. 223.
- Photius*, of Constantinople, his learning, i. 383. explains Aristotle, 384. character, 398. 406. explains scripture, 405. (o), (p), first controversy between the Greeks and Latins on his account, 419. mutual excommunications, and springs of the pope's acting here, 420. second contest, in which Photius is degraded, and articles of heresy brought against the Latins, 421. and (y), answered, 422. restored to his see, by the pope's consent, on a condition, which being unfulfilled, is excommunicated, and again degraded, with the pope's unjust demands, which the Greeks refuse, *ib.*
- Pietism*, controversy about, ii. 453. Spener's private meetings, and book of *Pious Desires*, for promoting vital religion, 454. abuses thereon, and commotions at Leipzig, and Pietists, to whom applied, 455. progress of these debates, *ib.* and consequences of fanaticism, 456. and (m), two classes of these revivers of piety, and the leaders of them first, *ib.* subject of these debates, 457. a thorough reformation of the divinity-schools proposed,

- posed, with the disputes thereon, 458. the 2d great object, which gives rise to endless debates, *ib.* these pietists go still further in two points, with the objections here, 459. the third thing they insisted on, *ib.* various characters of those who endeavoured to promote piety at the expence of truth, 460.
- Pietists*, their controversies in xviii cent. ii. 572. order founded in xvii cent. 376.
- Piety* of viii cent. i. 363.
- Pisa*, council there in xvi cent. ii. 6.
- Pius II.* pope, his great character, how tarnished, i. 784. gets the Pragmatic Sanction abrogated in France, and instance of his impudence and perfidy, 785.
- Pius IV.* account of, ii. 97.
- V. *ib.* and (g).
- Place*, M. de la, contests in xvii cent. about original sin, ii. 488.
- Placette*, La, his moral works, ii. 481.
- Plato*, defects of his philosophy, with an accusation against him, not strictly true, i. 11. (g) and (h), his opinions, by whom adopted in xii cent. 565. contest about these, and peripatetic doctrines, *ib.*
- Platonics*, their tenets, i. 10. their defects, 11. more frequented than the Stoics, i. 82. new, their rise in ii cent. *ib.* why so called, and effects of their seeming candor, 83. whence called Eclectics, *ib.* prefer Plato's opinion, and their system approved by the Christians, 83. their law of conduct to the philosophers, 97. rise and progress of this discipline, and its effects, 98. in iv cent. expositors of Christianity, 193, 194. modern, in iv cent. and fate, 179. of v cent. in the E. 238. at Alexandria and Athens, *ib.*
- Platonists*, their attempts against Christianity, i. 129. different sects, and to what owing, 133. modern, favoured by Julian, 179. why persecuted under Valentinian, 180.
- Pletho*, Gemistius, promotes Platonism in xv cent. i. 766.
- Plotinus*, his works and doctrine universally propagated, i. 132. and (h).
- Plutarch*, account of his renewing the academy at Athens, i. 81. 133.
- Poiret*, Peter, account of that Bourignonist in xvii cent. ii. 557, 558. and (h).
- Poles*, converted in x cent. i. 433.
- Polliac*, John de, opposes the mendicants in France, but why in vain, i. 731.
- Polycarp*, his Epistle to the Philippians, i. 52. when martyred, 79.
- Pomeranians*, converted in xii cent. by Otho bishop of Bamberg, i. 550. and (a), receive Albert their first bishop, 551.
- Popes*, see *Clergy*, their authority subordinate to the emperor's, i. 359. instances proving this, 360. confined to narrow bounds, and yet claimed supreme dominion over the church and kings, 361.
- Pontiffs*, Roman, grant to them by Lewis the Meek, spurious, i. 391. and (q), by Charles the Bald, ingratitude, with the frauds used to increase their power, and attachment to the kings of France, 392. gain much in ix cent. from the troubles in the empire, 393. divest the emperors of ecclesiastical power, and diminish that of the councils and bishops, 394. and (y), procure forged memorials, acts, &c. to establish their supremacy, *ib.* and (z), as the decretals, 395. and (a), the decisions of a pretended council under Silvester, with the success of these frauds, *ib.* infamous in x cent. 447. their authority how increased in x cent. 451. in xi cent. 486. augmented under Leo IX. 487, 488. under Nicolas II. 489. extend their authority, 572. and the unhappy effects, 639. their corruption in xiii cent. *ib.* inculcate a pernicious maxim, 640. but not universally adopted, *ib.* and (m), claim the power of creating higher or lower orders in the church, exemplified in some, 641. imitated by their legates, *ib.* wealth and revenues augmented under Innocent III. and Nicolas IV. 642. several examples of the former's tyranny, 643. to the emperor, Philip of France, and John of England, with interdict against the latter kingdom, and excommunication of the prince, 644. his subjects loosed from their allegiance, and himself deposed, resigns his crown, which he makes tributary, 645. their corruption in xiii cent. *ib.* Honorius III's zeal for the Roman see, *ib.* calamities from Gregory IX's ambition, 646. accusation against the emperor Frederic II. and

- and his defence, 647. arrogance of Innocent IV. who deposes the emperor, and now began the Guelphs and Ghibelines, 648. transactions under Alexander IV. Urban IV. and Gregory X. 649. Innocent V. Adrian V. John XXI. and Nicolas III. 650. Martin IV. and Nicolas IV. *ib.* Celestine V's quiet pontificate, and the plague of Boniface VIII's, 651. their contests with various sects in xiii cent. 695. agreement of the latter in one point, 696. and clergy, complaints against them in xvi cent. ineffectual, ii. 4. and (*b*). their avarice in xvi cent. ii. 8. contrivances to gratify it by indulgences, and their authority held inferior to a council, ii. *ib.* their zeal in propagating Christianity, 75. means used for that end, 76. how elected, 84. personal power limited, 85. distinction between him and the court of Rome, 87. (*e*), debates concerning his power, *ib.* method for repairing their losses by foreign missions, 88. their missions to the Egyptians, 89. Armenians, 90. and Nestorians, *ib.* in xvi cent. 97. why better since the Reformation than before, 98. and less usurping, *ib.*
- Pordage*, account of that follower of Jane Leadley in xvii cent. ii. 558.
- Poree*, Gilbert, i. 597. attacked by St. Bernard, with the charge against him, 602.
- Poretta*, Margaret, dangerous position maintained by her, and fate, i. 756.
- Porphyry*, account of, propagating Plotinus's doctrine, i. 133. and (*k*), his works, 129. burnt by Constantine's order, *ib.* (*c*), the answers lost, *ib. in fine.*
- Prague*, Jerome of, condemned and burnt alive in xv cent. i. 775. true causes, *ib.* and (*x*), 776. (*a*) and (*b*).
- Predestinarians*, whence their rise, i. 276. tenets, 277. their existence as a sect denied, *ib.* and (*g*).
- Predestination and Grace*, controversy in ix cent. about, i. 415. set on foot by Godeschalcus, 416.
- Prætorius*, his works in xvii cent. ii. 467.
- Præxas*, his tenets, names thence given his followers, i. 118.
- Prayers*, addition made to them in xiv cent. i. 753.
- Premontre*, order founded by Norbert in xii cent. i. 588.
- Presbyter*, its import, i. 45. (*a*), 46. (*d*).
- Prescription*, how pleaded against error, i. 144. and (*m*).
- Prestor John*, who, i. 432. in xii cent. 555. and (*n*), loses his life and kingdom in xii cent. from Genghizcan, 593. effects on Christianity, *ib.*
- Priesthood*, artful parallel between the Christian and Jewish, i. 88. its pernicious effects, 89.
- Primasius*, of Adrumetum, his works, i. 294. 296, 297.
- Printing*, its discovery in xv cent. propagates the sciences, i. 764. and (*p*).
- Priscillian*, his Gnostic heresy, i. 224. his banishment and death, with a character of his persecutor Ithacius, 225. and (*m*), his tenets propagated after his death, *ib.* and (*o*).
- Procession* of relics in xii cent. i. 595.
- Proclus*, his character, his masters and disciples, i. 239. and (*m*).
- Procopius*, of Gaza, his works, i. 293. his character as an expositor, 296.
- Propagation* of the Gospel in foreign parts, account of that society, ii. 309.
- Prophets* of the New Testament, their office, i. 46. some in xvii cent. ii. 469.
- Prosper*, his works, i. 247. 253.
- Protestants*, the first, and why so called, ii. 40. and (*b*), deliberate about a confederacy, on the emperor's arresting their ambassadors, but come to no conclusion, *ib.* dispute about the Eucharist promotes discord, 41. their affairs take an unfavourable turn, 61. their attempts for the gospel in foreign parts, 77. and (*b*), their missions in America, 307. persecuted by Rome in xvii cent. 344. persecuted in France, 345. milder methods used by Rome, 348. different proposals of their enemies, with public and private conferences between the doctors of both churches, but the breach is widened, 349. and (*n*), methods of reconciliation by the Romanists ineffectual, *ib.*
- Protestants*, French, peace-makers among them in xvii cent. ii. 351. English, William Forbes, 352. and (*a*), Dutch, Grotius, with the fruits of their labours, 4 Q 2 and

and George Calixtus's conduct, *ib.* defections from the Protestant to the Romish church, in this cent. personal only, 355. as Christina of Sweden, *ib.* (*m*), Ernest of Hesse, 356. and (*n*), and learned men, *ib.*

Prussians, converted in xiii cent. i. 627. by the Teutonic knights, i. 627.

Psellus, Michael, expounds Aristotle, i. 384. his great character, i. 478. 524. commentaries, 527.

Ptolemaites, Valentinian sect, i. 116.

Puritans, their rise in xvi cent. 205. uncharitableness of the Lutherans to these exiles, and humanity of the Reformed, *ib.* and (*k*), two classes refuse to assent to queen Elizabeth's proceedings, 206. their history, by Neal, and character, *ib.* and (*m*), their doctrine and sentiments, ii. 207. exasperated further, and opinion about excommunication, 208. (*o*), disgusted at the rites imposed, *ib.* (*p*) (*q*) and (*r*), at other usages, 209. the principles of their sentiments on church government and worship, in answer to those of the high commission, 209, 211, controversy between them and the church of England, with the conduct of the Helvetic church to the latter, and the reasons, 231. about doctrinal points, 232. and (*d*).

Q.

Quakers in xvii cent. ii. 503. their history and rise, 532. and (*i*), first attempts under Cromwell, 533. and (*k*), wise precautions of Cromwell against them, 534. progress under Charles II. and why severely punished, *ib.* and (*o*), tolerated by James II. and the motive, 535. and (*r*), confirmed by king William, and his motive, with their propagation out of England, *ib.* their intestine disputes, 536. in Pennsylvania through Keith, with his tenets, and excommunication, 537. and (*y*), their religion in general, *ib.* from Barclay's books, and their character, 538. and (*b*), with other writings *in fin.* not. their fundamental doctrine, and tenets flowing from it, 539. doctrine about Christ, 540. the

different opinions, 541. religious worship and discipline, *ib.* two moral precepts, 542. form of ecclesiastical government, 543.

Quietists, Hesychasts, controversies raised by them in xiv cent. i. 753. state of these, 754. and (*q*).

Quietism, Molinos doctrine, contests in xvii cent. ii. 407.

Quinisextum, council of Constantinople, i. 328. and (*g*), 336. enact laws about ceremonies, with the nature of its acts, six of which the Romanists reject, *ib.* and (*u*).

R.

Rabanus, Maurus, great character of, i. 387—499. his commentaries, 406. allegorical commentator, 407.

Racow, catechism of, 277. and (*q*), collection of popular tenets, and not a rule of faith, 278.

Radbert, Pascasius, his explication of the church doctrine about the sacrament, and that of Bertram, with an account of both, i. 414. Scotus's precision, with the fluctuating opinions of others, 415.

Ramus, Peter, his character, ii. 81.

Rasa, Procopius, head of the Hussites, i. 795.

Rathman, Herman, controversy by his writings in xvii cent. ii. 464. doctrine misunderstood or misrepresented, 465. his real doctrine, *ib.*

Ratisbon Diet, memorial for peace, and the result, ii. 59. new conference there, the Protestants protest against the Trent decrees, and are proscribed, 61.

Realists, i. 388. and (*b*), schoolmen mostly such in xiii cent. 685. their defects, 686. disputes with the Nominalists in xiv. cent. 718.

Reformation, its history in xvi cent. ii. 3. and (*a*), the people how prepared in some measure, 8. much desired, 14. how far aimed at, and its dawn rises unexpectedly, 15. distinction in that of Sweden and Denmark, 46. and (*w*), the measures taken about doctrine and discipline commendable, but not so in reforming the clergy, 47. strictures here, and expediency

- pediency of the change, *ib.* (*w*) and (*x*), its rise and progress in France, 47. in other states of Europe, 49. history from Augsborg confession till the war after the Smalcald league, ii. 50.
- Reformation* of the Romish church, a plan for it and the substance, ii. 59. (*w*).
- Reformation*, its history from the Smalcald war to the peace of religion at Augsborg, ii. 60.
- Reformation* gains ground in England, ii. 67. how encouraged by Edward VI. and his character, *ib.*
- Reformation* in Scotland, ii. 97. by Knox, 68. and (*g*).
- Reformation* in Ireland, ii. 69.
- Reformation* takes place in the United Provinces, ii. 71. conduct of the nobility and people, *ib.* (*o*), religion of Switzerland established, and universal toleration, with some distinction, 72. and (*q*).
- Reformation* in Italy, its progress, *ib.*
- Reformation* in Spain, its progress soon quashed, ii. 73. and executions on Charles V's death, *ib.*
- Reformation*, a judgment of it, and the means used for producing it, ii. 74.
- Reformation* civilized many nations, ii. 83.
- Reinboth*, singularity of his opinions in xvii cent. ii. 466. opposed by Danhaver, *ib.*
- Religion*, early method of teaching it, i. 53. its state in iv cent. 190. especially in the disputes at Nice about the Trinity, *ib.* fictitious, and increase of superstitions to what owing, 191. hence pious frauds, 192. versions of the scriptures, as Jerome's and many interpreters, yet few of solid judgment, 193. method of explaining the Christian doctrines on Origen's model, *ib.* Gregory Nazianzen and Augustin III. fathers of scholastic theology, *ib.* many points determined in v cent. 248. consequences, and superstition increases, *ib.* in supplicating saints and worshiping their images, 249. efficacy in martyrs bones, and the figure of the cross, with purification of departed souls, and advancement to the Romish church, 250.
- Religion* practical, its state in vi cent. and methods of advancing it, i. 298.
- Religion*, its deplorable state and superstitions in vii cent. 324. exemplified from St. Eloi's life, *ib.* and (*w*), placed in purifying fire and offerings, &c. *ib.* and (*x*), solution of all doubts by the authority of the church, and working miracles, 325. its state in x cent. 455. its state in xi cent. 525. its general corruption and causes in xiii cent. 682. new articles of faith imposed, *ib.* its corrupt state in xiv cent. 747. also in xv cent. 793. defenders of the true raised in several places, 794.
- Religions*, the variety among the Pagans occasions no wars nor dissensions, this accounted for, i. 4.
- Religion*, two classes, and evil tendency, i. 8. none able to remedy their extravagance, *ib.*
- Remigius*, of Auxerre, his expositions, i. 406. his works, 407.
- Reuchlinus*, John Capnion, restores learning in xv cent. i. 766.
- Rhodes*, Alexander, his mission to Siam, &c. ii. 290. success, and the pope's regulations thwarted by the Jesuits, with the latter's injurious treatment of the papal missionaries, 291. and (*o*).
- Richer*, character of his interpretations of scripture, ii. 110.
- Racci*, Matthew, his labours in China, ii. 77. founder of the Christian church in China, declares for the innocence of Chinese rites, and how explained, 296. this opinion rejected by some missionaries, *ib.* and (*w*), progress of this dispute in favour of the Jesuits, yet turns against them, 297. bustle on both sides at the pope's appointing a congregation to examine it, *ib.* and (*x*), reducible to two great points, and the first of these with the question stated, 298. answered by the Jesuits in the affirmative, and why neither side satisfactory, *ib.* 2d point, and the question therefrom, 299. the Jesuits conclusion from it, whether justifiable, *ib.* and (*y*), what their adversaries maintain, with an account of the honours paid Confucius, *ib.* and (*z*).

Richlieu.

- Richlieu*, cardinal, his attempt to reclaim the Protestants, ii. 350. followed by others, *ib.*
- Ritual*, Roman, several additions in vii cent. i. 329.
- Robinson*, John, founder of the independants in xvii cent. ii. 501.
- Rochester*, earl, conversion and character, ii. 312. (c) and (d).
- Roderic*, Christopher, account of his mission to the Egyptians, ii. 89.
- Roell*, controversy set on foot in Holland about the use of reason in religion, ii. 513. two questions, to which reducible with his abettors and opponents, *ib.* silence imposed, and a dispute about words, 514. about the generation of the Son, &c. condemned, *ib.* and (t).
- Rollo*, first duke of Normandy, converted to Christianity, i. 432. the motives, 433.
- Romanis*, Humbert de, i. 681. mystic works, 688.
- Romans* give the names of their Deities to those of other countries, which occasions perplexity, &c. in the ancient superstitions, i. 4. and (h), their religion differs from the Greeks, 7. introduce their rites among the conquered nations, 8. why they persecuted the Christians, 30. other causes, 31.
- Romans* introduce philosophy and letters into the Provinces, 42.
- Roman*, Republic, its state, i. 71.
- Roman empire* under four chiefs in iv cent. i. 163.
- Roman empire*, its state in v cent. i. 228.
- Rome*, state of learning, and chiefly philosophical sects, i. 41.
- Rome*, pre-eminence of the bishop in iii cent. i. 135. yet equality of the episcopal order in authority from St. Cyprian's dispute with Stephen, *ib.* and (q).
- Rome*, rank and dignity of the bishop in iv cent. to what owing, 183. tumults at chusing a pontif on Liberius's death, 184.
- Rome*, limits of that bishop's authority, i. 184. yet several steps laid for his subsequent despotism, and by whose imprudence, *ib.* and (n), IVth canon of Sardis supposed the chief step, 185. (o) and (p).
- Rome*, bishop, his power in v cent. and favourable circumstances for augmenting it in the East, i. 243. other causes of its increase in the West, *ib.*
- Rome*, the supremacy of its bishops not acknowledged in v cent. i. 273. and (s).
- Rome*, its pontif aims at unlimited supremacy in vi cent. i. 289. Ennodius's flattery, *ib.* and (u), aversion against this yoke, and power limited by the Gothic princes, *ib.* to whom the pontifs submitted, 290.
- Rome*, disputes with Constantinople about pre-eminence in vii cent. i. 320. granted the former by Phocas, *ib.*
- Rome*, proofs of the subordination to the regal authority, i. 320. passage by which the emperor abdicated the privilege of confirmation insufficient, 321. and (i).
- Rome*, the nature and form of the pope's jurisdiction in Charlemagne's time, i. 356. and (z), Constantine's grant extant with those of others, *ib.* and (z), ambition and revenues diminished by the Greek emperors, and why, 357. this the chief cause of disputes afterwards, 358.
- Rome*, declension of the church, ii. 88.
- Rome*, the internal constitution strengthened, ii. 92.
- Rome*, despotic maxim of that court, ii. 98.
- Roman Catholic faith*, whence derived, ii. 105. uncertainty 106. different opinions about determining doctrine and controversies, *ib.*
- Roman Catholic religion*, its principal sources, 108. and (k).
- Rome*, the controversies that divide that church, ii. 114. between its several orders, yet tempered by the popes, *ib.* the more momentous, 115. the popes effort to diminish their violence, and two opposite parties, *ib.* six heads of debate, 116. the first and second, *ib.* and (y), third and fourth, 117. fifth, 118. and (b), sixth, 119, 120. and (e).
- Rome*, junction with the Russian church attempted in vain, ii. 142. more successful in Poland and Kiovia, but few conquests

quests among the Monophysites, Nestorians, and Armenians, 143. among the Georgians and Mengrelians, and labours of its missionaries little fruit, *ib.* popes assiduity in extending their dominion in the East, and lenity, 144. and (*w*).

Rome attempts to ruin the Protestants, ii. 338. methods used, but unsuccessful, 339. writers on both sides, *ib.* the interest of that church loses ground in the East, ii. 357. two striking instances of it, *ib.* the popes authority likewise loses ground, 360.

Rome, rupture between pope Paul V. and Venice, ii. 361. wise conduct of the latter, and peace concluded through Henry IV. of France, *ib.* (*y*) and (*z*), the consequences, and their separation how prevented, 362. (*a*) and (*b*).

Rome, contest with Portugal in xvii cent. ii. 362. the former gains no ground, 363. and (*c*), — between it and the French, with the former's stratagems defeated, and the writers in this contest variously treated, 364. contests under Lewis XIV. when peace was concluded on inglorious terms for the pope, 365. a second contest on the regale, *ib.* (*f*) and (*g*), Lewis summons an assembly of bishops, 366. and (*h*), which drew up four propositions, opposed by the pontif publicly and privately, *ib.* (*i*) and (*k*), 3d contest, on right of asylum to ambassadors at Rome, and accommodation, 367, whether the papal authority gained ground in this century, with the complaints in the affirmative groundless, and the manner of terminating differences changed, 368. Gallican liberties still maintained, *ib.* and (*q*), some flatterers fawn still on the popes, 369. secret, yet vigorous methods used by the French against the popes, who are treated by their monarchs as Pagan heroes behaved to Cerberus, *ib.*

Rome, its state of learning in that church in xvii cent. ii. 378, improved by the French, 379. philosophy much changed in France, and these most distinguished in it, 380. ill-treatment, *ib.* and (*a*), the French example followed in Italy; &c.

and the Jesuits, who most improved learning, 381. Benedictines, and decline among the Jesuits ever since, *ib.* emulation of the priests of the oratory in literature, and the most distinguished, 382. Jansenists of Port-royal most eminent, and reason for these improvements, with chief authors in the Romish communion, 383. and (*r*), its doctrine corrupted by the Jesuits, whence derived, and with what views propagated, 384. why supported by the popes, *ib.* sap the foundations of morality, with several pernicious maxims, 385. (*s*) and (*t*), books writ against them by Pascal and Perrault both burnt, 386. and (*w*), answered by F. Daniel, *ib.* *sub not.* highly complained of, and condemned by the pope, yet their morals not suppressed, 387. and (*x*), why the great made them their confessors, *ib.* their maxims and practices not adopted by all the fraternity, 388. three circumstances necessary in general censures, which their adversaries have seldom observed, *ib.* exegetic theology in this cent. 389. Scripture how obscured, *ib.* and (*a*), Quenel's New Testament excepted, *ib.* (*b*) and (*c*), didactic, moral, polemic theology, 390. contests under Clement VIII. between the Jesuits and Dominicans about grace, *ib.* insinuation of the arbiters appointed by the pope in favour of the Dominicans, 391. who himself re-examines the controversy, but dies before decision, *ib.* continued under Paul V. and ordered to be suppressed, with liberty to each party of following their respective opinions, 392. the pope how hindered from a public determination, *ib.* and (*f*).

Rosary, its institution in x cent. i. 462, 463.

Roscellinus, controversy by him in xi cent. i. 548. and (*z*).

Rosetrucians, derivation, ii. 324. and (*e*), inveigh against the Peripatetics, 325. most eminent, with their followers, and diversity of opinions, whence, with some common principles, *ib.*

Rothman, Bernard, becomes Anabaptist, ii. 240.

Rufinus,

Rufinus, of Aquileia, account of, i. 190. and (o), friendship and rupture between him and Jerome, *ib.*

Ruggeri, account of his impiety, ii. 315.

Russians, converted in ix cent. and Lequien's inaccurate account, i. 380. and (b).

S.

Sabellius's account of the Trinity, i. 157. how different from Noetus, *ib.*

Sadducees, their tenets, i. 14. their moral doctrines, and bad influence, 16.

Sagarelli, Gerh. founds the sect of the Apostles in xiii cent. and his fate, i. 709.

Saints, lives, writers of, in vi cent. i. 298. executed contemptibly, and wretched models of piety, 299.

Saints, multiplied in x cent. 458. accounted for, 459. added to the Romish kalendar in xvii cent. ii. 413, 414. and (z).

Saladin, his success against the Christians i. 558. after dreadful carnage, reduces Jerusalem, *ib.*

Salisbury, John of, his great character, i. 592.

Salvian, his book on divine government, i. 235. his character, 247. and (u), his opinion about holiness, 255.

Samaritans, their sad state, i. 18. notions of the Messiah, whether juster than those of Jerusalem, 19.

Samogetæ converted in xv cent. i. 762.

Sanction, Pragmatic, for retrenching papal power, i. 784. (n), and *.

Sarabaites, abandon'd profligates, i. 199. and (u).

Saracens, writers against them in ix cent. false reports about them, i. 409. their progress in x cent. 439. learning among them, 442. scheme for their expulsion out of Spain in xiv cent. i. 714. become masters in the East, 343. their progress in the West in viii cent. 343. consequences to Christianity, *ib.* their progress in ix cent. 381. dismal effects on the gospel in the East, but more favourable in the West, 382. how driven out of Sicily in xi cent. 467. with the privileges thereon, *ib.* in Palestine expeditions formed against them, 468. by Peter the Hermit, with the progress, and

history of this holy war, 469. and (s), difficulties and successes, 470. and (u), motives of the popes and European princes, 471. and (y), reasons for and against these wars, 472. and (z), bad consequences, and many evils attending them in civil life, 473. and (a), 474. and (b), with respect to religion, and still more unhappy effects, 475. (f) and (g).

Sardis, fourth canon, supposed the chief step to the bishop of Rome's sovereignty, i. 185. impossibility of proving by it an appeal to Rome in all cases, with the import of this canon, *ib.* (p).

Saturninus, of Antioch, account of that heretic and his extravagant fancies, i. 109.

Savanarola, Jerome, his high character and fate, i. 792. bold declaration, 794. labours to reform the schoolmen in xv cent. 798, 799. his triumph of the cross, 800.

Saurin, James, his tenet about swerving from truth, ii. 578.

Saxons, in viii cent. why averse to Christianity, i. 340. (h) and (i), methods for converting and retaining them, 341. and (i), *in fine.*

Sceptics, their method, ii. 333. the most eminent in xvii cent. 334. and notes.

Schaal, John Adam, account of that Jesuit missionary in China, ii. 293.

Schade, John Caspar, his character in xvii cent. ii. 463.

Schism, the great western, continued in xv cent. i. 769. both pontifs condemned by the council of Pisa, which elects a third, 770. afflicts the church in xv cent. 782. healed under Nicholas V. 783. between the Greeks and Latins, why not healed in xv cent. 800.

Schmidt, Laurent, his new translation of the Bible in xviii cent. and fate, ii. 571. and (t).

Scholastics, proper, in xii cent. i. 598. their author, 599. opposed from different quarters, 600.

Schoolmen, whence so called, i. 298. their manner of teaching divinity in xiii cent. 686. reasons for this, 687. why much opposed, with their wretched quibbling, *ib.* also by the Mystics, whom they flatter,

- flatter, 688. in xiii cent. divided the virtues into two classes, *ib.*
- Schoolmen*, contests among them, i. 749.
- Schools*, public, their sad state in xvi cent. ii. 12.
- Schuurman*, Anna Maria, collegiant, in xvii cent. ii. 556.
- Schwenkfeldt*, character of him, ii. 166. his doctrine different from Luther's in the points, 167.
- Schyn*, character of that Mennonite's writings, ii. 234. *sub (f)*.
- Sciences*, in vii cent. their sad state, i. 319.
- Science*, its limits extended in xiii cent. i. 637. and *(d)*.
- Sciences*, their state in xiv cent. i. 717.
- their improvement in xvii cent. ii. 319. how by Bacon, 320.
- Sciences*, their improvement in general, in natural philosophy, mathematics, and astronomy, ii. 320. those eminent therein through Europe, 321. their distinguished promoters who, and advantages hence arising to society and religion, *ib.*
- Scioppius*, employed to write against the Protestants, with an account of his being caned, ii. 339. and *(n)*.
- Sclavonians* and Rugen isle converted in xii cent. by Waldemar I. of Denmark, through Absalom of Lunden, i. 551. and *(b)*.
- Sclavonians* converted by Henry the Lion, through the ministry of Vicelinus, in xii cent. i. 553.
- Scot*, Mich. i. 636. and *(y)*.
- Scotish* (Irish) ecclesiastics, propagate the gospel in vii cent. i. 311.
- Scotland*, whether Christian in iii cent. i. 125.
- Scotland*, form of church-government there, how far adopted from Geneva, ii. 222. and *(z)*.
- Scots* (Irish) lovers of learning in viii cent. i. 366. and *(m)*, illustrated religion by the principles of philosophy, 367. *sub not.* with a sophism of theirs about the Trinity, *ib.*
- Scotus*, Johan. Erigena, i. 387. and *(a)*, his works, 388. his notions, and great modesty, *ib.* *(b)*.
- Scotus*, Johan. Erigena, his great character, i. 400.
- Scotus*, Johannes, his method of explaining Christianity, i. 407. and *(s)*.
- Scotus*, Johannes, his new translation of the pretended Dionysius's works, i. 409.
- Scotus*, Marianus, account of, i. 524.
- Scotus*, John Duns, his character, i. 747, 748. his chief glory, 750.
- Scriptures*, early method of interpreting, i. 53.
- Scriptures*, wretched commentators on them in xvi cent. ii. 110. others more wise, *ib.*
- Scriptures*, zeal of many for propagating them, i. 141.
- Scripture*, interpreters of, in v cent. i. 250.
- Scriptures*, few expositors of, in vii cent. i. 325.
- Scriptures*, Charlemagne's zeal for the study of, i. 364.
- Scriptures*, their exposition neglected in ix cent. among the Greeks, i. 405.
- Scriptures*, method of explaining them in xiii cent. continues, i. 684. exemplified, *ib.*
- Scripture-knowledge*, its state in xvi cent. ii. 109. severe law as to interpretation, and taken from the people, 110.
- Scythia*, within Imaus, converted to Christianity in viii cent. i. 337. and *(a)*.
- Sects*, in the apostles times, i. 62. grow apace, and obscurity herein to what owing, *ib.*
- Sects*, illiterate, i. 119.
- Sects*, remains of the ancient in iv cent. i. 210. Manichean most prevalent, who conceal themselves under various names, *ib.* their remains in vii cent. 329. recover strength in viii cent. 375.
- Sects*, which arose from oriental philosophy, i. 108.
- Sects*, ancient, subsist in ix cent. i. 426.
- Sects*, ancient, in xi cent. i. 543.
- Sects* of Scotists and Thomists, with their chief points of dispute, i. 543.
- Sects*, among the Latins in xii cent. and the abuses whence, i. 610.
- Sects*, various in England in xviii cent. ii. 577.
- Secundians*, Valentinian sect, i. 116.
- Sedulius's* Expositions, i. 406.
- Seidel*, Martin, account of him and his wild notions, in xvii cent. ii. 472.
- 4 R
- Seidenbecker,

Seidenbecker, Geo. Laur. in xvii cent. ii. 471.

Semi-judaizers, Socinian sect, ii. 280. and (y).

Semi-pelagians, author of that sect, and their tenets, i. 277. their five leading principles, *ib.* (h), how it stood out, and made rapid progress, 278.

Semi-pelagians, in vi cent. in the West, i. 305.

Senenſis, Bernardinus, i. 792. 799.

Serapion, his treatise against the Jews, i. 131.

Serapion, his successful mission among the Armenians, ii. 90.

Servetus, Michael, account of him and his writings, ii. 260.

Servetus, seized, and accused by Calvin of blasphemy, ii. 260. and (d), condemned to the flames, with an alleviation of Calvin's conduct, 261. and (e), strange doctrine about the Trinity, and other Anti-trinitarians after him, 262.

Sethites, their tenets, i. 117.

Severian, character of his works, i. 253.

Severus, his character, i. 71. persecution under him, 79.

Severus, Alexander, his favours towards the Christians, and to whom owing, i. 123.

Severus, persecution under that emperor, and the martyrs who suffered, i. 126.

Sfondrati, Cœlestine, his innovations, ii. 412. the pope's conduct here, 413. and (x).

Shaftesbury, Earl, his works, ii. 312. and (e), how dangerous to Christianity, *ib.*

Siam, account of the first mission of the French, and their success, ii. 290. embassy sent by Lewis XIV. to convert the king and people, 291. and (p).

Siam, its king's acute answer to a French memorial, ii. 292. (q), toleration of the mission, till he and his minister Faulkon are killed, and then all hopes lost, *ib.* and (r).

Sidonius, Apollinaris, his character, i. 248.

Siganſu, famous Chinese monument found there, i. 310. and (a).

Sigismund, John, Elector of Brandenburg, from Lutheran becomes Reformed, in xvii cent. ii. 428. adopts not all their

tenets, and grants entire liberty to his subjects, but the effects of this liberty not answerable, *ib.* Lutherans disgust whence, 429. controversy hereupon, and the form of concord, &c. suppressed, with his motive, *ib.*

Silvester II. pope, his epistle exhorting Christians to a holy war, i. 438. and (z).

Simeon, bishop of Jerusalem, crucified by Trajan's law, i. 77.

Simeon, head of the Stylites, makes several converts, i. 230. his ridiculous enthusiasm, i. 254. and (p), had many followers, *ib.* and (q), 255. and (r).

Simeon, of Constantinople, account of, i. 454.

Simeon, the younger, account of, i. 524. his mystic works, i. 530.

Sixtus, bishop of Rome, suffers under Valerian, i. 128.

Sixtus V. pope, his character, ii. 97. and (g).

Smalcald, league, how formed, ii. 53. substance of their invitation to Henry VIII. and his answer, 54. (h), what influenced the emperor to peace, *ib.*

Smalcald, articles, account of, 147. and (b).

Socinian, different senses of, ii. 258.

Socinianism, errors about its origin, ii. 263, 264. (m), its real origin, 265. progress, 266.

Socinianism, how propagated in Transylvania and Hungary, ii. 273.

Socinianism, its main principle, ii. 275. its dangerous consequences, 276. sum of their theology and moral doctrine, 77.

Socinians, their history, name, and origin, ii. 257. their Polish version of the bible, and a summary of their religion, ii. 267, 268. account of the Cracow catechism and its six points, *ib.* (z), how first denominated, 271. their methods of propagating their doctrine, 274. yet fail almost every where, *ib.* their first attempts in Holland and by whom, *ib.* also in Britain and Germany unsuccessful, 275. state of learning among them, 278. their method of proceeding in theology, 279. their divisions and intestine controversies, *ib.* effect of the death of their chief

- chief, Faustus, 282. their flourishing state in xvii cent. 548. their missions and peculiar method of making professytes, 549. the success not answerable, with their decline at Altorf through Sohner's death, &c. and in Poland with their sufferings, 550. fate of these exiles and little success in an establishment, 551. account of their state in xviii cent. 579.
- Socinus*, Lælius, his character, ii. 258.
- Socinus*, Faustus, ii. 258. his dextrous proceedings, 271. changes the ancient Unitarian religion, 272. what hand Lælius had in this, and its great success, *ib. (d)*, publishes the Cracow catechism, 273. patronized by Jacobus à Sieno, who turns Socinian, *ib.*
- Solitarius*, Philip, his character, i. 590. account of his Dioptra, 602.
- Sammer*, John, a disciple of Budæus, ii. 280 and (*x*).
- Sophronius*, bishop of Jerusalem, his character, i. 323.
- Sorbonne*, Robert de, account of him, with his character, i. 633.
- Spina*, Alphonso, account of, i. 792. his fortress of faith, 800.
- Spire*, resolutions of that diet in favour of Luther, ii. 38. progress of the Reformation afterwards and the causes, *ib.* another dyet held here, which revokes the resolutions of the former, 39. and (*f*), considered as iniquitous and intolerable by several princes they protest against, 40. who these princes were, *ib. (b)*.
- Spinoza*, account of that atheist, with his wisdom and probity, ii. 316. and (*q*), his works and the tenets therein, *ib. (r)*, never attempted to make converts, 317. (*r*), seduced into his system by Cartes's philosophy, *ib.* and (*s*), want of perspicuity in his system, which is easily misunderstood by those of the greatest sagacity, 318. and (*t*), account of his followers, *ib.*
- Stancarus*, debates excited by him in refutation of Osiander, ii. 177.
- Stephen* establishes Christianity among the Hungarians, i. 434.
- Stiefel*, Isaiah, account of that fanatic in xviii cent. ii. 470.
- Stoics*, their explication of the divine nature and the human soul, i. 10. their notions of fate unjustly represented, *ib.* and (*f*).
- Strabo*, Walafrius, account of his works, i. 400.
- Struchtmeier*, of Harderwyk, account of his absurd system about Paganism and Christianity, i. 175. (*m*).
- Stylites* (pillar-saints) in v cent. their superstitious phrenzy, i. 254.
- Subschal*, Jesu, his conversions in viii cent. in Hyrcania, i. 337.
- Sublapsarians*, who, ii. 483.
- Suidas*, account of, i. 454.
- Sulpicius Severus*, of Gaul, account of that historian, i. 190. and (*p*).
- Superstition*, its increase in vi cent. i. 195. to what owing, and exemplified by the doctrines taught, 296 and (*x*). multiplied in this century by various rites, with the occasion of them, 303. in ix cent. insinuates itself into civil life, and the source what, 424. exemplified in several trials for proof of innocence, *ib.* how fed by many vain opinions in x cent. 457. particularly that about immediate judgement, with the effects, 458. and (*w*), reigns among the people in xii cent. 594.
- Supralapsarians*, account of, ii. 483.
- Supremacy*, of Rome, opposed by many in vii cent. i. 320, 321.
- Sueno*, of Denmark, apostatizes, and embraces Christianity anew, i. 436.
- Sweden*, progress of the Reformation there, vii. 43.
- Swedes*, convert many in Finland and Lapland, ii. 78.
- Switzerland*, origin of the Reformation there. See *Zuingli*.
- Switzerland*, disputes there in xvii cent. about the form of concord, ii. 517. disputes about it in xviii cent. 578.
- Sylvester*, II. Pope, restores learning in x cent. i. 445. his character, *ib.* derived his knowledge from the Arabians in Spain, with the effects of his example, 446.

- Sylvester*, Gerbert, account of, i. 454.
Syntellus, George, account of, i. 361.
Syncellus, Michael, panegyric on Dionysius, i. 408.
Syncretistical (Calixtine) controversies rise, ii. 447. share which Buscher had in them, 448. the animated opposition of Calixtus to his Saxon accusers, 449. and (d), continuation of these debates by Calovius, &c. with a new creed, *ib.* and (e), able defenders of Calixtus who, 450. and the issue of those disputes, *ib.*
Syncretists, Platonic, in xv cent. account of them, i. 767. chargeable with many errors, *ib.*
Synods, account of their origin, and canons formed there, i. 88.

T.

- Tabor*, mount, why so called, i. 794.
Taborites, in Bohemia, who, and their demands, i. 796. some of their detestable maxims, *ib.* (x), new model'd, 797.
Taion, bishop of Saragossa, character of his theological summary, i. 319, 326.
Tamerlane, compels many to apostatize, i. 715.
Tanquelinus, or Tanquelmus, account of him and his horrid blasphemy, in xii cent. i. 614.
Tartary, Christianity embraced there in x cent. i. 432.
Tartary, Christianity propagated in xi cent. 465. and by whom, *ib.* and (c).
Tartary, state of Christianity in xiv cent. i. 713.
Tatian's harmony of the gospels, i. 92.
 ——— account of him and his opinions, i. iii. his oration to the Greeks, and names of his followers taken from their austerity, *ib.* and (p).
Teleseus, account of his philosophy and character, ii. 81. and (o).
Telingius, character of his writings, ii. 227.
Tellius, Sylvester, banished Geneva, ii. 262.
Templars, account of their knights, why suppressed, i. 560. their extirpation in xiv. cent, 759. their intolerable impiety the cause, 760. reflexion on the crimes laid to their charge, *ib.* and (l).
Temples to the Saints multiplied in vi cent. and the opinions adopted about them, i. 304.
Tartaries among the Franciscans, who, i. 674. (q) and (r).
Tertullian's apology, when written, i. 79. ——— account of him and his works, i. 90. and (q).
Tertullian, why unsuccessful against the Jews, i. 93.
Tertullian's treatises on morality, character of them, i. 94.
Tertullian's work against hereticks, i. 94.
Tertullian, a follower of Montanus, i. 121. and (c).
Testament, Old and New, what, i. 53. ——— New, its translations how useful, and the principal, i. 73.
Tetzel, John, his matchless impudence and impiety in preaching up indulgencies, ii. 16. and (o), see *Luther*.
Teutonic, knights, account of them, i. 561.
Thalassius, a moral writer in vii. cent. i. 326.
Theatins, their institution in xvi cent. and by whom, ii. 102.—female convents, *ib.*
Theodore, abbot of Raithu, his book against sects, i. 323. — Christ's incarnation, 326.
Theodore, of Tarsus, archbishop of Canterbury, promotes learning in England, i. 319.
Theodore, of Tarsus, restores penance in vii cent. i. 327. account of his new penitential, its propagation and decline, *ib.* and (c).
Theodore, of Mopsuestia, his character, i. 246. and (n).
Theodore, of Mopsuestia, his commentaries on the Scriptures, i. 250. and (c), how he applied the prophecies, and the cry against him, 251. (g) and (h).
Theodore, of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, seconds Origen's defence in vi cent. i. 299.

Theodoret,

Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, his character, i. 246. and (b).
Theodoret's commentaries on the Scripture, why more successful in illustrating the New Testament. i. 250. and (b).
Theodorus, Studites, his character and works, i. 398. and (n).—Graptus, *ib.*—Abucara, *ib.* and (o).
Theodosius, the Great, his zeal against Paganism, i. 174.
Theodosius, the Younger, his zeal in extirpating idolatry in the East, i. 229.
Theodotus, his tenets, i. 118. uncertainty about these, 119.
Theodotus, of Ancyra, i. 246.
Theodulphus, bishop of Orleans, account of, i. 362.
Theology, scholastic, whence derived, i. 140. mystic, whence, and the manner of reasoning, *ib.* strange effects in the rise of monks and hermits, 141.
Theology, didactic writers in iii cent. i. 143. moral writers, and controversial, many, 144.
Theology, didactic, in v cent. i. 251.
 — explanatory, its state in vi cent. i. 296.
Theology, positive, whence derived, i. 297.
 — scholastic, whence, 298.
Theology, polemic, shocking writers, in vi cent. i. 299.
Theology, didactic, in vii cent. i. 325.
 — polemic, its state in vii cent. i. 327.
Theology, explanatory in viii cent. i. 363.
 — didactic, its state in viii cent. i. 366. collects only opinions of the fryars, *ib.*
Theology, didactic, its state in ix cent. i. 407.
Theology, polemic, its state in ix cent. i. 409.
Theology, its state in x cent. i. 460.
 — scholastic, in xi cent. i. 528. first authors, and their moderation, *ib.* and (c).
Theology, controversial, its state in xi cent. i. 530.
Theology, didactic, its state in xiii cent. i. 685.

Theology, controversial, its state in xiii cent. i. 689.
Theology, explanatory, its state in xiv cent. i. 748.
Theology, manner of teaching it in xii cent. i. 597. different sects at Paris, 598.
Theology, its wretched state in xvi cent. ii. 12. most of its teachers Positivi and Sententarii, 13. liberty of debating religious subjects, *ib.*
Theology, Christian method of teaching it improved in xvi cent. ii. 82. its genius better explained than formerly, *ib.*—didactic in xvi cent. 111.
Theology, Romish writers in xvi cent. ii. 105. and (c).—college in Paris reform there, 111.—academical law about it, *ib.* and (q).
Theopaschites, whence derived, i. 271. and (i), 272.
Theophanes, account of, i. 361.
Theophanes, Cerameus, account of, i. 523.
Theophanes, bishop of Nice, his works, i. 747.
Theophanes, his works, 751.
Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, account of his works, i. 89. and (p).
Theophilus's Exposition of the Gospel lost, i. 92.
Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, why he drives out the monks of Nitria, i. 205.
Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, his character, i. 246.
Theophrastus, character of him, ii. 81.
Theophylact, his impious character, i. 446. and (o).
Theophylact, his works, i. 527.
Theosophists, their character, ii. 82.
Therapeutæ, whether a branch of the Essenes, i. 16.
Theresa, St. reforms the Carmelites (White fryars), ii. 101.
Thessalonica, Simeon, account of his works, i. 790.
Theurgy, among Ammonius's followers, i. 85.
Thomas, bishop of Heraclea, his 2d Syriac version of the New Testament, i. 325.
Thomas of Straßburgh, i. 747.

- Tiberius* proposed Christ to be enrolled among the Gods, i. 26. and (b).
Tilbury, Gervais, his character, i. 634. and (o).
Timotheus's confutation in vii cent. of the various heresies, i. 327.
Toland, his character and works, with the answers to them, ii. 313. and (f), account of his Pantheisticon, 318. and (u).
Tostatus, Alphonsus, his works and character, i. 792, 798.
Trajan, his character, i. 71.
 —, persecution of Christ under him, order to Pliny, and its effects, i. 76.
Trajan, learning flourishes under him, i. 81.
Transylvania, Socinianism how publicly established there, ii. 273.
Trapezond, George, his works, i. 791.
Trent, a council proposed by the pope to meet there, ii. 59. why objected to by the Protestants, and how dissolved, 62.
Trent, project of a council there renewed, ii. 64. conditions on which Maurice of Saxony consented to it, *ib.* (c), steps taken by the Protestants for providing against events, *ib.*
Trent, congregation for interpreting decrees, ii. 106. council for what assembled, and complaints against it, 107. decrees how received, *ib.*
Trials of innocence in ix cent. by cold water, single combat, fire ordeal and the cross, i. 422. and (f), account of each, *ib.* *sub not.* whence derived, 425. accompanied with the Lord's supper, 426.
Trinity, doctrine of, disputes in iv cent. about it, i. 215. the church had frequently decided against the Sabellians as to a real difference of the persons, but not as to its nature, 216. most held Origen's opinion, and what, *ib.*
Trinity, whether one may be said to have suffered controversy about, i. 302. and (u), hence whether Christ's person could be considered as compounded, 303.
Tripoly, Philip, i. 636. and (y).
Tritheists, in vi cent. their rise and founder, i. 309. divided into two parties, and their tenets, *ib.*
Trithemius, restores learning in xv cent. i. 766.
Trivium, what, i. 481 and (k).
Trullan Council, why so called, see *Quinisextum*.
Turks, their successful incursion into the East, subduing the Saracens and Greeks, in viii cent. i. 343.
Turks, their progress in the utter ruin of the Saracens in x cent. i. 439.
Turlupius, in xiii cent. who, i. 703. and (t).
Turrecremata, John, i. 792. refutes the Saracens, 800.
Type, or Formulary, an edict by the emperor Constantine, account of it, i. 343. which with the Ecthesis are condemned by pope Martin, who is imprisoned in Naxos, and the turbulent monks banished, &c. by the emperor, *ib.* whose son Constantine Pogonatus summons the Vth General Council, which condemns the Monothelites, and pope Honorius, 344.
- U.
- Ukerwallists*, Anabaptist sect in xvii. cent. ii. 546. odd hypothesis about Judas's salvation, adherence to Menno's tenets, sordid appearance they make, and rigour therein, 547.
Ulphilas, bishop of the Mœsian Goths in vi cent. his gospels, i. 177. and (s).
Understanding, men of, account of that sect in xv cent. i. 805. their tenets, 806. a branch of brothers and sisters of the free spirit, *ib.* had several sensible opinions, *ib.*
Universities, hypothetical, ii. 487.
Urban VI. pope, his character, i. 728.
 — *VIII.* pope, Barberini, his character, ii. 336. his poems, &c. *ib.* and (d).
Ursulines, nunneries of, ii. 102.
- V.
- Val-Ombroso*, account of monks there, i. 518.
Valentine,

Valentine, eminence of that heretic, and account of his tenets, i. 115. his idle dreams, and various sects derived from him, 116. and (u).

Valerian, peace and persecution under him, i. 128.

Valla, Laurentius, account of his Annotations on the New Testament, i. 798.

Vandals in Africa, horrid severity in v cent. against the Catholics, i. 261.

Vanini, his impious treatises and fate, ii. 315. (k) and (l), his apologists, *ib.* and (m).

Vendôme, Gregory, of his works, i. 592.

——— Matthew, account of, i. 634.

Verschorists, account of that Dutch sect in xviii cent. ii. 515. why called Hebrews, 516. tenets common with the Hattemists, *ib.*

Vicelinus, converts the Slavonians in xii cent. i. 553.

Victor of Capua, his Chain on the Gospels, i. 297.

Victor, Hugh, of St. his works and character, i. 592, 597.

Victor, Richard, account of him and his works, i. 592, 597.

Victor, Walter, of St. i. 598. refutes the scholastics, 600. and (p).

Victor, Hugh, of St. 598. on beasts, 751.

Victor, Richard, refutes the Jews, 603.

Victorinus's Explications lost, i. 143.

Vigilantius, controversy with Jerome, and result through the latter's fury, i. 255.

Vigilius, pope of Rome, often changes sides, i. 301, 302.

Villa Dei, Alexander, character of his works, i. 635.

Villa Nova, Arnold, his character, i. 638. ill treatment, *ib.*

Vincent of Lerins, his character, i. 248. and (w).

Vitriaco, Jacobus de, his character, i. 634, 680.

Voetians, in Holland, a sect in xvii cent. ii. 510.

Volusianus, persecution under him, i. 128.

Vulgate, account of that Latin Bible, ii. 109. and (l), solemnly adopted by the council of Trent, *ib.* and (m).

W.

Waldemar I. of Denmark, converts the Slavonians and inhabitants of Rugen in xii cent. by means of Absalom of Lunden, i. 551. and (b).

Waldenses, their origin, in xii cent. names and history, i. 615.

Waldenses, distinguished from the inhabitants of Piedmont valleys, i. 616. and (g).

Waldenses, their doctrine, discipline, views, and rapid progress, i. 616, 617. and (i).

Waldenses, their form of government, i. 617. (k) and (l).

Waldenses, two classes of laity amongst them, i. 618.

Waldenses, account of their internal differences, 618. and (m).

Waldenses, their increase in xiv cent. i. 748.

Waldenses, in xv cent. where, i. 803. ——— account of their reformation, ii. 215.

Waldenses, their sufferings in xvii cent. ii. 476.

Walter, head of the Beghards, in xiv cent. his fate and character, i. 757. and (e).

Wansleb, account of his mission, by Ernest of Saxe-Gotha, to Abyssinia, ii. 423. and (x).

Wansleb, why he turns Romanist, ii. 423.

War, holy, the first plan formed in x cent. i. 438.

Wardner, Dr. character of his Ecclesiastical history, i. 328. and (e).

Waterlandians, account of that Anabaptist sect, their tenets, and two sects of them, ii. 547.

Weigelius, Valentine, account of his writings in xvii cent. ii. 468.

Wertheim's translation of the Bible in xviii cent. ii. 571. and (t).

Wesselus,

- Wesselus*, John, his high character, i. 792.
- Westphal*, Joachim, renews the controversy on the Eucharist, and how conducted, ii. 194. and (b), answered by Calvin, and the consequences, *ib*.
- Whiston*, William, account of him, ii. 579.
- White*, Thomas, singular opinions in xvii cent. condemned, ii. 412. and (t).
- Whitefield*, George, account of his tenets, ii. 577.
- Wickliff*, John, his character, and opposition to the Mendicants and popes, i. 731.
- Wickliff*, John, his adversaries and event of councils against him, i. 732.
- Wickliff*, John, his bones dug and burnt, i. 733.
- Wilhelmina*, account of that fanatic in xiii cent. i. 708.
- Willibrord*, an Anglo-Saxon, propagates the gospel in vii cent, i. 312.
- Willibrord's* labours in the gospel, i. 340.
- Witnesses* of the truth in xi cent. who attempted a reformation, i. 526.
- Witnesses*, why they miscarried, and the errors consequent on their ill-grounded notions, i. 527.
- Wlodomir*, first Christian duke of Russia, i. 433.
- Wlodomir*, a high St. among the Russians, i. 434.
- Worms*, the conference there, ii. 59. removed to the Diet at Ratisbon, *ib*.
- Worship*, public, its form in iv cent. i. 207. and (s).
- Worship*, its variety of liturgies, whence, i. 207.
- Worship*, changes introduced into many parts, and five festivals, i. 208.
- Worship*, Epiphany kept in the East as the Saviour's birth-day, and 25th of December in the West, i. 208.
- Worship*, Martyr-festivals how multiplied, and sad abuses therein, i. 209.
- Worship*, Fasting, why established, and different from that of former times, with administration of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, i. 209.
- Worship*, Masses and adoration of the Symbols, whence, i. 210.
- Worship*, nature of the Lord's Supper, why concealed in iv cent. by the preachers, i. 210.
- Worship*, religious, nature of that in xvi cent. ii. 13. wretched sermons and common-place subjects, with the true causes of the people's ignorance, superstition, and corruption of manners, 14. hence an ardent desire of reformation, and how far, *ib*.
- Writers*, Didactic, in iv cent. i. 193.
- Latin, the chief in iv cent. i. 188.
- in v cent. 246.
- in vi cent. 293, 295.
- in vii cent. 323.
- in viii cent. 361.
- in ix cent. 399.
- in x cent. 454.
- in xi cent. 524.
- in xii cent. 591.
- in xiii cent. 680.
- in xv cent. 791.
- Writers*, Greek and Oriental in vi cent. i. 293.
- Writers*, Greek, in vii cent. i. 322.
- and Eastern in viii cent. 361.
- Writers*, Greek, the chief in ix cent. 398.
- Writers*, why few eminent among the Greeks in x cent. 442.
- Writers*, Greek, in x cent. 454.
- chief in xi cent. 478, 523.
- in xii cent. 590.
- in xiii cent. 679.
- in xiv cent. 746.
- in xv cent. 790.
- Lutheran, in xvi cent. ii. 187. and (o).
- Writers*, moral, in vii cent. wretched productions, i. 326.
- Writers*, moral, in viii cent. 367.
- in xi cent. 529.
- Polemic, in xii cent. chief views i. 603.

X.

Xavier, Francis, zeal and character of that missionary, ii. 77. and (f), his labours in India and Japan, *ib.*

Ximenius, Rodericus, his character, i. 634.

Z.

Zeno's Henoticon for reconciliation in x cent: subscribed by the moderate, i. 272.

Zigabenus, Euthymius, his works, i. 591. Polemic writer, 603. his character, 604.

Zinzendorff, count, account of his disciples in xviii cent. ii. 570.

Ziska, John, famous head of the Hussites, i. 794, his prudence and intrepidity, 795.

Zonaras, John, his character, i. 564. works, 591.

Zosimus, account of his history, i. 236.

Zuingli, Ulric, his great character, ii. 26. (i) (k) and (l), his resolution and success against Sampson the monk, and gets the pope's supremacy rejected in Switzerland, 27. some few blemishes, and uprightness withal, *ib.* his opinion about the Eucharist, 34, 197. and (n), embraced in Switzerland and Germany, 35. clears himself from accusations of heresy to Luther's satisfaction, 41. the founder of the Reformed church, and his character, 190. aimed at simplicity of worship, but perhaps went too far, *ib.* and (t), differed from Luther in several points, *ib.* falls in battle, 192. censure of the Lutherans here, *ib.* and (a), his book about true and false religion, 225.

F I N I S.

182

634
 The name, however, has changed.
 Some in India and Japan, it is
 the same as in the West, and
 the name, however, has changed.

James Hamilton for reconciliation in a
case initiated by the moderate.

Poland: Warsaw, 1901.

MUSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

2 1 7 1 7

11. 104